THE FUNDAMENTAL VEDĀNTA :

UPANIṢADS, THE BRAHMASŪTRA AND BHĀṢYAS

(A Critique of the Viṣayavākyas of the Brahmasūtra)

Dr. Vijay Pandya

THE FUNDAMENTAL VEDĀNTA :
UPANIṢADS, THE BRAHMASŪTRA AND BHĀṢYAS

Dr. Vijay Pandya

PP

THE FUNDAMENTAL VEDĀNTA :

UPANIṢADS, THE BRAHMASŪTRA AND BHĀṢYAS

(A Critique of the Viṣayavākyas of the Brahmasūtra)

Dr. VIJAY PANDYA

THE FUNDAMENTAL VEDĀNTA :

UPANIṢADS, THE BRAHMASŪTRA AND BHĀṢYAS

Dr. VIJAY PANDYA

This book puports to discuss the Fundamental Vedānta in the context of the Upaniṣads, Brahmasūtra along with the Bhāṣyas on it.

Upaniṣads form the core of the Indian Philosophy and the Brahmasūtra seeks to systematise the Upaniṣadic philosophy. Brahmasūtra is one of the most intractable works of the Fundamental Vedānta. This work aims at ascertaining the relation between the Upaniṣads and the Brahmasūtra with the assistance of the Bhāṣyas on the sūtras.

In short it is a detailed critique of the Viṣayavākyas of the Brahmasūtra.

Radhakrishnan's work on the Brhmasūtra was of a pioneering nature in this field, though it discussed a very few Bhāṣyas.

This books takes into account the entire Brahmasūtra and about ten or eleven Bhāṣyas in the field and the considerable literature on it which has come into existence in the field of Vedānta, especially the Brahmasūtra.

So this book is a valuable addition in the field of Upaniṣads, Brahmasūtra and Bhāṣyas which are inseparable in themselves.

THE FUNDAMENTAL VEDĀNTA

UPANIṢADS, THE BRAHMASŪTRA AND BHĀṢYAS

(A Critique of the Viṣayavākyas of
the Brahmasūtra)

Dr. VIJAY PANDYA
Honorary Professor, L.D. Institute of Indology
&
Formerly Professor, Department of Sanskrit,
School of Languages, Gujarat University,
Ahmedabad - 380009

PARIMAL PUBLICATIONS
DELHI - AHMEDABAD

Published by

Parimal Publications

Office : 27/28, Shakti Nagar, Delhi-110007 (India)
Retail Outlet : 22/3, Shakti Nagar, Delhi-110007 (India)
Ph. : +91-1123845456, 47015168, 65441516
e-mail : order@parimalpublication.com
url : http://www.parimalpublication.com

Branch Office

F-3 (1st Floor), Rambha Complex, Opp. Gujarat Vidyapeeth
Ashram Road, Ahmedabad-380009
Ph. : +91-79-65440276

First Edition : Year 2009

ISBN : 978-81-7110-349-2

Price : Rs. 550.00

Printed by

Vishal Kaushik Printers

Near G.T.B. Hospital, Jagat Puri Vistar,
Shahdara, Delhi-110093

FOR

THE MOST VENERATED

V. KUTUMBA SHASTRI

a *rendezvous*
(a confluence place)
of many *vidyās*

With utmost reverence and humility

-Vijay Pandya

FOREWORD

Dr. Laxmesh Joshi
Retd. Prof. and Head,
Sanskrit Department Gujarat University,
Ahmedabad

This book, The Fundamental Vedānta, will certainly prove to be a very essential addition to the research-field of the Vedānta. Dr. Vijaya Pandya has scholastically attempted to extract the essence from the discussions regarding the v.v. (viṣayavākyas) of the B.S. (Brahmasūtras) made by the ancient commentators during the period of more than a millenium. Similarly he has also endeavoured to give the views in a condensed form, regarding the v.v. of the B.S., presented by the modern critics during the last century.

Dr. Pandya has not only referred to the views in regard to the v.v. presented by the five well known commentators, Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja, Nimbārka, Madhva and Vallabha, but also has referred to the views of the other Bhāṣyakāras, namely Bhāskara, Vijñānabhikṣu and Baladeva.

Modern critics like V.S. Ghate, S.K. Belvalkar, Srisachandra Vidyarṇava (sic), P.M. Modi, S. Radhakrihnan, B.N.K. Sharma, S.M. Bhatkhande, George Adam (Jr.), all these have attempted to ascertain the v.v. of the B.S. But some of them have put more emphasis on the comparison of the interpretation of the B.S. made by the ancient Ācāryas than on the search of the v.v. For instance, V.S. Ghate has said nothing in his book, 'The Vedānta,' (pp. 53,54) about the v.v. of the first four sūtras. Secondly, some of these modern critics have attempted to trace out the v.v. only of the some portion of the B.S. Thirdly, some of them seem to have a some sort of proclivity towards the ancient Ācārya, Madhva or Vallabha.

But Dr. Vijaya Pandya has, I think for the first time, endeavoured to trace out the v.v. of the all Brahmasūtras, without any partiality, solely on the basis of reasoning. In ascertaining the v.v., sometimes, Dr. Pandya agrees with Śaṅkara, sometimes with Madhva or Vallabha. Having meticulously studied the views in

regard to the v.v., held by the ancient commentators as well as by the modern critics he has given his own conclusion in his lucid English language.

I am confident that when the task of preparing the critical text of the Brahmasūtra will be embarked upon, this book, 'The Fundamental Vedānta' will provide the pivotal base for the same.

I feel very much pleased to know that the task of publishing this valuable thesis has been undertaken by Parimal Publications, Delhi. I heartily congratulate the publisher Shri K.L. Joshi. At the end, I would like to suggest that this book may also be translated into Hindi and Gujarati. So that the larger class of the Vedānta-readers can have an opportunity to read it.

L.V. Joshi

PREFACE

The book originally a thesis, presented here, has a chequered history. Dr. (Ms.) E.A. Solomon, then the Professor and Head of the Sanskrit Department, School of Languages, Gujarat University, Ahmedabad, first suggested this subject, for my thesis, way back around in 1980. I took up the subject and started reading for it under the able guidance of Dr. (Ms.) E.A. Solomon. Meanwhile I got the teacher-fellowship of the University Grants Commission. But, unfortunately, during the tenure of the teacher fellowships, I could not present the thesis for the Degree of Ph.D. and Dr. (Ms.) E.A. Solomon retired from the service.

The thesis remained in a state of hibernation for a long time.

Meanwhile I joined the Department of Sanskrit, Gujarat University, Ahmedabad.

And the thesis was revived by Dr. L.V. Joshi, Professor and Head of the Sanskrit Department, Gujarat University. And it is entirely due to Dr. Laxmesh V. Joshi, my respected guide and esteemed colleague, that this thesis, as the cliche goes, sees the ray of the day-light. Infact it was at his instance I undertook the publication of the thesis in a book form. Babubhai of Parshva Publications constantly provided me an impetus to complete the hard task of completing and publishing the book. I have no words to express my gratitude to Babubhai. I also thank my Ph.D. student Prof. Rajvi Ojha for her immense help in various ways in publication of this book.

Something about the subject of the thesis.

I took up the subject because to the best of my knowledge, nobody had previously dealt with the Viṣayavākyas of the Brahmasūtra in its entirety, though there were some scholars like Dr. P.M. Modi and B.N.K. Sharma who had treated the subject in a limited way.

'The Viṣayavākyas (v.v.) of the Brahmasūtra' can very well be alternatively entitled as 'A Critique of the Viṣayavākyas of the

Brahmasūtra.' Here barring the 2-1 and 2-2 of the Brahmasūtra for the reasons adduced there in the chapter 6, almost all the sūtras have been discussed from the v.v. point of view. This can be called the *raison detre* of this book.

In ascertaining the v.v. I have scrupulously refrained from entering into the intricate labyrinths of the interpretation, for its own sake. Sometimes I have rest contented with merely stating the various positions taken by different scholars, sometimes, I do express my opinion with reasoning. Manytimes, I have critically oxamined the opinions put forth by different ancient commentators and modern scholars. Occasionally, I have differed from all the scholars ancient as well as modern and stated my own vv.

These few Viṣayavākyas discovered by us along with the critique of the v.vs. of almost all the Brahmasūtras may be regarded as a distinct contribution of the book. It is for the scholars to judge its value.

We have followed Śaṅkara as far as the text of the sūtras and its division into adhikaraṇas are concerned. Śaṅkara has been our starting point or a sort of a springboard so to say, like many of our predecessors to take a plunge into the discussion. In that way, Śaṅkara has been indispensable.

We have regularly taken into consideration the bhāṣyas by Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja, Madhva and Vallabha (We have continued to ascribe the portion beyond 3-2-33 to Vallabha's name, though generally believed to be not from his pen. following other scholars in the field). We have occasionally referred to the bhāṣyas by Bhāskara, Baladeva and Vijñānabhikṣu.

Now it is time for thanks-giving.

It has been a long journey and on the way, I met many people who, apart from the pūrvasūrins, have contributed to the fruition of the thesis and the treatise.

My heart bears a chiaroscuro of a rainbow of gratitude to those innumerable individuals.

But first things first.

First of all, all the credit for the thesis goes to my respected guide and esteemed colleague Dr. L.V. Joshi. But for him, this thesis would not have been completed. As noted earlier, this thesis was in a state of hibernation and it was Joshisaheb who revived it, making it recover from stupor. Not only he resuscitated the thesis, but with many valuable suggestions made with sharp critical acumen, combined with erudition, he changed the whole complexion of the thesis. He literally lifted me from the morass of dejection, and constantly inspired and goaded me towards the completion of the thesis. So I express my deep gratitude to Dr. Laxmesh V. Joshi. I know, I am trying to express what is essentially inexpressible.

Next I must thank Dr. E.A. Solomon. It was she who originally put me on the journey. She also gave a lot of her valuable time in going through the thesis in its preparatory stage and making important suggestions with her critical insight. I am grateful to her. Alas! She is no more to see this book.

Then I must thank my dear friend Dr. Gautambhai Patel, then Head of the Sanskrit Deptt., Xavier's College, Ahmedabad, for having put the college-library at my disposal.

I must also thank the staff of the Gujarat University Library, for the co-operation I got from them.

I must also record my thanks to Dr. (Miss) Saloni Joshi, the then Librarian and the authorities of the L.D. Institute of Indology, Ahmedabad, for allowing me to use their rich library. I also thank Shree Kanubhai Sheth of the Indology, for his co-operation.

I must record my thanks to the University Grants Commission, New Delhi for granting me a teacher-fellowship for research purpose.

I also express my heartfelt gratitude to Shri K.C Parikh, the then Pro V.C. of the Gujarat University, who helped me in many ways in the administrative matters related to UGC and is very

affectionate to me. I cannot repay his love and affection towards me! His sad demise is a personal loss to me indeed!

I must thank the enlightened management of Shree Lunawada Arts, Science and Commerce College, Lunawada (PMS) who permitted me to avail of the UGC- Teacher fellowship, especially its president and my intimate friend Prof. H.H. Patel, then Head of the Economics Department, Lunawada College and now an M.L.A. (2009) and Shri Hariprasadbhai Joshi, the secretary of the management. I record my thanks to the retd. Prin. Dr. R.G. Bhatt, of the college at Lunawada. I also thank my colleague Prof. N.R. Patidar, now then Head of the Sanskrit Deptt., Lunawada College, Lunawada, for his excellent co-operation.

Then there are so many friends and colleagues who have helped me in procuring some books, from various quarters. I thank my dear friend and now Head of the Sanskrit Deptt., M.S. University, Vadodara, Prof. Rajendra Nanavati, Prof. P.C. Vora of L.D. Arts College, Ahmedabad, my student Nilakshi Pandya and some others, I might have missed, forgetting to thank.

I thank my childhood friend Shri Jayanti J. Shah, then Rector, Diamond Jubilee Boys' Hostel, Ahmedabad, his wife Indiraben whose house was a home for me away from home.

I also thank the University authorities, especially the P.G. Section of the Gujarat University. I thank Late Shri V.L. Bhatt, Head of the P.G. section, Shri Modi, Shri Bhavasar and Shri Shrikant Vyas, once my student and now friend, all of the P.G. Section, for their cooperation in all the official matters.

As I lay down the pen wielded for the thesis, and a sort of vacum surrounds me. I know this void will be filled in a short time by other academic pursuits waiting for me. However, still, I would miss many things.

In the immediate future, I would miss my many Sunday mornings which I used to spend at Joshisaheb's place, discussing the thesis and I would also miss those inevitable cups of tea or coffee (depending upon my mood!) with refreshments offered with affection by Minaben, wife of Dr. L.V. Joshi.

I would also miss those lengthening shadows of the evenings at the Department, where, we would be engrossed in the discussion of the thesis, oblivious of the time.

I would also miss those lifts on the scooter offered by my guide while returning home and dropping me at my residence.

I would also miss those inevitable well-intended and otherwise queries regarding my thesis.

I miss them all, and I thank them all connected with my thesis, in whatever capacity.

At this moment a face stands out from my crowded memory and gently rebuking me asks, 'Moṭābhāi, have you forgotten me?' I miss my younger brother Gopal (Hemant) who passed away at a very young age of 37. He was very eager to see my thesis completed. I shall always miss him. Life is never the same again!

At this moment I offer my Praṇāmas to my parents Shri Devshanker Dayashanker Pandya and Savitaben Devshanker Pandya.

At this moment I offer my praṇāmas to my Gurus of college-days viz. late Prin. Dr. K.R. Potdar, Dr. (Ms.) G.V. Davane (both of the Ismail Yusuf College, Bombay) and Dr. Kshirasagar, then Head of the Sanskrit Deptt., Elphinstone College, Bombay.

Behind every success, there is a woman, thus the adage goes. My wife Jaya, stands there, by my side, through thick and thin, taking care of all my comforts and herself undergoing all inconveniences and discomforts due to my preoccupation with the book. I must thank her, though she would not care any less for that matter.

I thank my errand-boy, I mean my son Samvedan who would take care of my innumerable sundry matters.

In my personal familial life, I find many changes have taken place. My dear and dynamic daughter Zarmar whom I call my conscience has settled in Sydney, Australia with her husband Hemal Joshi to explore new horizons in life. When I was going through the proofs of the book, she was here and was a source of strength to me.

One daughter gone abroad and another daughter (in-law) Chaitali stepped into our family life like a whiff of fresh air. She took care of me during the writing of the book, and my physical ailment, and continues to be affection-incarnate! One more (grand) daughter Neti- the little angel has entered into our life to spread the light of delight. I am thankful to my family members and grateful to God! And last but not least, I offer my thanks to Shri Kanaiyalal Joshi of Parimal Publications, Delhi who undertook to bring out the book and whose scholarship also bettered my book. I also thanks his well-mannered son Shri Himanshu Joshi for offering his active cooperation in bringing out this book.

It has been perhaps the most spiritually satisfying and elevating experience to be at the feet of those great acāryas of the hoary age.

From the deep recesses of my heart a grateful longing rises and goes to the God, maker of this world and me who has given me this beautiful life and opportunity to be in company of those saints!

I stand in silence!

6th May 2009 **Vijaya Pandya**

ABBREVIATIONS

V.V.	-	Viṣayavākya
B.S.	-	Brahmasūtra
NSP.	-	Nirṇayasāgara press
B.G.	-	Bhagavadgītā
MBH.	-	Mahābhārata
U.	-	Upaniṣad
A.U.	-	Aitareya Upaniṣad
B.U.	-	Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad
C.U.	-	Chāndogya Upaniṣad
J.U.	-	Jābāla Upaniṣad
Kaṭha U.	-	Kaṭha Upaniṣad
Kau. U.	-	Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad
K.U.	-	Kena Upaniṣad
M.U.	-	Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad
P.U.	-	Praśna Upaniṣad
T.U.	-	Taittirīya Upaniṣad
Nṛsut.U.	-	Nṛsiṁhottaratāpanīya Upaniṣad
Rāma U.	-	Rāmatāpanīya Upaniṣad
S.B.	-	Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa
A.A.	-	Aitareya Āraṇyaka
T.A.	-	Taittirīya Āraṇyaka

CONTENTS

CHAPTER - 1

INTERPRETATION OF THE BRAHMASŪTRA

Difficulties and Solutions

In order to correctly understand and interpret the Brahmasūtras, one has to first take into account the difficulties besetting their study. A student of the Brahmasūtra encounters a number of difficulties in ascertaining and interpreting the correct meaning of the Brahmasūtras. These difficulties may be briefly enumerated here.

The main difficulty in understanding the Brahmasūtras arises from their nature of being very elliptical. The traditional definition of a sūtra in general is applicable to the Brahmasūtras as well. The definition or rather description of a sūtra as given in Madhvabhāṣya is as follows:

स्वल्पाक्षरमसंदिग्धं सारवद्विश्वतोमुखम्।
अस्तोभमनवद्यं च सूत्रं सूत्रविदो विदुः।।[1]

A sūtra is a statement having few words, free from ambiguity, containing the essence, having all-round application, free from any obstruction (in the form of verbiage) and free from any blemish.

So in the sūtra-literature, the first condition is generally very meticulously observed. But the same thing cannot be said about other characteristics, at least for us after centuries when the tradition of the teacher-taught is broken. The sūtra is generally not free from ambiguity. It's quality of comprehending all that is to be said makes it liable to be interpreted in various ways. This is applicable in a large measure to the Brahmasūtras also. But it is quite probable that, the unintelligibility of the sūtras is greatly enhanced due to the big gap in time from the date when they were composed. (circa 200 B.C.).[2]

Belvalkar describes sūtras in general as concise mnemonic

---

1. Madhva- Pūrṇaprajña Darśana of Ānandatīrtha, Ed. Pandit Jibananda Vidyasagara, B.S. 1-1-1
2. 'It was composed about the second century B.C.', Radhakrishnan, Brahmasūtra, Introduction, p. 22

rules originally intended as helps to memory.[1] Brahmasūtras are also similarly very concise.

Thibaut has made some pertinent observation regarding the Brahmasūtras. He says 'Their (Sūtras)' outward form is that common to all the so called sūtras which aim at condensing a given body of doctrine in a number of concise aphoristic sentences and often even mere detached words, in lieu of sentences. Besides the Mīmāṁsā sūtras, this literary form is common to the fundamental works on the other philosophic systems, on the Vedic sacrifices, on domestic ceremonies, on sacred law, on grammar and on metres.... Altogether different is the case of the two Mīmāṁsā sūtras. There scarcely- one single sūtra is intelligible without a commentary. The most essential words are habitually dispensed with, nothing is more common than the simple omission of the subject or predicate of a sentence. And when, here and there, a sūtra occurs whose words construe without anything having to be supplied, the phraseology is so eminently vague and obscure that without the help derived from commentary we would be unable to make out to what subject the sūtra refers'.[2]

The opinion of V.S. Ghate differs from that of Thibaut. Ghate considers the Brahmasūtras 'much more intelligible'. However, he also admits they are in themselves quite sufficient to give rise to a number of interpretations'.[3]

Apart from the nature of the sūtras being obscure, there are several other difficulties one has to face while studying the Brahmasūtras. Philosophers of different faiths and various hues, have seen their systems of philosophy in the Brahmasūtras. The Brahmasūtras are of such a nature that, they are capable of being interpreted according to the philosophic inclinations of the interpreters. Or as Radhakrishnan in his inimitable style puts it. 'The sūtra is one of those rare books where each in accordance with the merits, finds his reward'.[4] For this phenomenon, there are various causes inherent in the Brahmasūtra itself. Sometimes, it is difficult to say which sūtras contain the Pūrvapakṣa and

1. Belvalkar S.K., Brahmasūtra 2-2-1, 2 Notes,.p.3
2. George Thibaut, Vedānta Sūtras Part-1, Introduction XIII-XIV
3. Ghate V.S., The Vedanta, Second Edition, p. 42
4. S. Radhakrishnan, Indian Philosophy Vol. 11, p. 432

which the Siddhānta. To illustrate, the adhikaraṇa 2-3-13, sūtras 19-28 are taken by Śaṅkara as pūrvapakṣa saying that jīva is aṇu or atomic in size and the sūtra 29 as the Siddhānta stating that the jīva is not really atomic but that it is all-pervading (vibhu). But Rāmānuja takes the first sūtra of the adhikaraṇa i.e. 19 as stating the Siddhānta view, according to which the individual soul is of minute size and the sūtras 20-25 are taken by him as supporting the Siddhānta and refuting the objections against it, and the remaining sūtras deal with another aspect of the aṇutva.

There is one more difficulty. Tradition has handed down to us the division of the sūtras into adhyāyas and pādas and there is unanimity among the commentators regarding it. But no such division into adhikaraṇas has come down to us. As for instance in the sūtras 1-3-41-43, according to Śaṅkara, the sūtra 41 forms one adhikaraṇa deciding that the ether which reveals names and forms referred to in C.U. 8-14-1 is Brahman and it is neither the element ether nor jīva. Sūtras 42 and 43 form another adhikaraṇa teaching that the Vijñānamaya mentioned in B.U. 4-3-7 is not the individual soul but Brahman. According to Rāmānuja, the three sūtras form one single adhikaraṇa which seek to establish that the ether is Brahman. For Madhva, these three sūtras form three different adhikaraṇas; sūtra 41 refers to ākāśa, sūtra 42 to the Vijñānamaya and sūtra 43 referring to another passage in B.V. 6-4-22 where the words सर्वस्याधिपतिः सर्वस्येशानः pertain to Viṣṇu or the Lord.

As noted above, the sūtras are elliptical and hence there is a necessity of supplying words to complete the meaning of the sūtras. This is also another source of divergence of opinion among the commentators. For example in 2-3-1 Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja and Nimbārka supply the word '*utpadyate*' (is produced) while Madhva supplies the word '*anutpattimat*' (not having origination).

Sometimes, the words in the sūtras, yield more than one meanings and hence, the meaning intended by the sūtrakāra becomes uncertain to gauge. In 2-3-15 अन्तराविज्ञानमनसा क्रमेण तल्लिङ्गादिति चेन्नाविशेषात्। (If it be said in between (Brahman and the elements) intellect and mind (are mentioned and so their creation and absorption are to be placed somewhere) in the order, on account of the inferential indications (in the text) to that effect,

(we say, not so, on account of the non-difference of the intellect and the mind from the elements). The word antarā may mean both in the 'midst' (madhya) and 'without' (vinā). Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja and Nimbārka accept the first meaning and thus the sūtra, according to them means that the mentioning of Vijñāna and manas in the midst of the passages referring to the creation of the elements need not disturb the order of creation, while according to Madhva, who accepts the second meaning; the sūtra means that the opposite orders of destruction (to that of creation) holds good, except in the case of Vijñāna and manas.

One more circumstance leading to the uncertainty of the meaning is the absence of the padapāṭha. Tradition of handing down the text of the sūtra along with the padapāṭhas has not come down. So there is an uncertainty regarding the split-up of the sūtras. For example, the sūtra 2-3-26 can be read as गुणाद्वालोकवत् or as गुणाद्वाऽऽलोकवत्. Both the readings are possible. According to Śaṅkara, the sūtra means that the jīva, though of minute size (aṇu) can be affected in part of the body owing to the pervasiveness of the quality of intelligence as is for instance the case with certain objects in the world (loka-vat) e.g. with the light of a lamp. According to Rāmānuja, Nimbārka and Madhva, however, ālokavat (like the light) gives the illustration required for the purpose more directly.

Another factor leading to the uncertainty of the meaning in that the Upaniṣadic passages or Viṣayavākyas which the sūtras are supposed to discuss are not actually incorporated in the sūtras. Different commentators may understand different passages as taken up for discussion and thus one and the same adhikaraṇa may yield different meanings. Thus in the sūtra 1-1-5, ईक्षतेर्नाशब्दम्, the sūtra means that the 'sat' in the passage cannot mean the pradhāna of the Sāṁkhyas, because the act of 'seeing' is spoken of. Thus the whole of the adhikaraṇa beginning with this sūtra is an attempt to show that the passages which the Sāṁkhya brings forward in support of the doctrine cannot but refer to Brahman if only properly interpreted with due consideration of the context. But Madhva interprets the adhikaraṇa in quite a different way. The passages or Viṣayavākyas, according to Madhva, are from P.U. 5-5 and B.U. 4-5-6 in which the ātman or puruṣa is spoken of as something to be seen or meditated upon, and the sūtra

accordingly means, that Brahman cannot be said to be aśabda i.e. inexpressible (avācya) because it is described as being something to be seen or known.

Besides these specific difficulties, there is one more difficulty of a general nature and that is in the form of uncertainty of the division of the text of the Brahmasūtra. Even Śaṅkara, the oldest commentator available did have an inkling of the uncertainty of the text. At one place in his bhāṣya, he shows awareness of the problem. While commenting on 3-2-21 he observes अत्र केचिद् द्वे अधिकरणे कल्पयन्ति। प्रथमं तावत् किं प्रत्यस्तमिताशेषप्रपञ्चमेकाकारं ब्रह्मोत प्रपञ्चवदनेकाकारोपेतमिति। द्वितीयं तु स्थिते प्रत्यस्तमितप्रपञ्चत्वे किं सल्लक्षणं ब्रह्मोत बोधलक्षणमुतोभयलक्षणमिति।

Again in his commentary on 4-3-14, he notices that some of his predecessors regard sūtras 4-5-7-11 as presenting the pūrvapakṣa and the sūtras 4-3-12-14 the siddhānta, but that he himself is responsible for his own view i.e. that the sūtras 4-3-7-11 present the siddhānta and sūtras 4-3-12-14 the pūrvapakṣa- केचित्पुनः पूर्वाणि पूर्वपक्षसूत्राणि भवन्त्युत्तराणि सिद्धान्तसूत्राणि इत्येतां व्यवस्थामनुरुध्यमानाः परविषया एव गतिश्रुतीः प्रतिष्ठापयन्ति, तदनुपपन्नं, गन्तव्यत्वानुपपत्तेर्ब्रह्मणः।

Similarly he notices a difference of readings. In 1-2-26 he reads पुरुषमपि चैनमधीयते and also notices a different reading पुरुषविधमपि चैनमधीयते। Or again in the sūtra 2-1-15 he notices two readings भावे चोपलब्धेः and भावाच्चोपलब्धेः।

Moreover, there is a controversy regarding the text of the Brahmasūtra discussed in great detail by S.K. Belvalkar. Belvalkar has put forth the theory that originally there was a Chāndogya Brahmasūtra composed by Jaimini. He writes, 'There is nothing improbable in a Chāndogya Brahmasūtra having in fact formed the original nucleus of the present sūtras and been even incorporated therein'.[1] Without entering into the greater details, it may suffice here to state that Belvalkar undertakes to locate the original Chāndogya B.S. by chopping off many of the sūtras from the present B. S. extant. For example, the Smṛtipāda (2-1), the Tarka-pāda (2-2), the Sṛṣṭivākyasamanvayapādas (2-3, 2-4), the guṇopasaṁhāra pāda (3-3) would not have a place in the original Chāndogya B. S. Similarly also the fourth pāda of the first

1. Belvalkar S.K., Basu Mallik Lectures on Vedānta, pp. 140-149

chapter which is an afterthought and which introduces in two of its adhikaraṇas (Sūtras 14-15 and 23-27), cosmological discussion not properly belonging to the avowed contents of the pāda. Further even in some of the adhikaraṇas to be retained, there will have to be effected not a little pruning. Thus in the first adhikaraṇa of 1-2 (sūtras 1-8), we will have to omit sūtra 5 because it refers apparently to Śatapatha, and sūtra 6 because it recites (or cites?) the authority of a smṛti. In adhikaraṇa 4 of the same pāda, sūtra 14 will have to be omitted, unless (as seems probable) the reference is to C.U. 4-11-7 and 4-12-1. And in chapter I, pāda II, adhikaraṇa 7 (sūtras 24-32) we should omit sūtras 25 and 26, make the reference in sūtra 32 with Rāmānuja to C.U. 5-18-12 rather than with Śaṅkara to Jābāla U. and omitting the sūtras 29 and 30 which refer to the views of Āśmarathya and Bādari, weld together sūtras 28 and 31 into one continuous sūtra to be thus worded साक्षादप्यविरोध: सम्पत्तेस्तथा हि दर्शयति। Some other possible alterations would be from 3-1; omit sūtras 3 and 4, and 13 to 16, and 19 to 20. Also drop the last three words from sūtra 7 (न वा प्रकरणभेदात्परोवरीयस्त्वादिवत्)।

Drop also sūtras 1-1-3 and 4 (शास्त्रयोनित्वात् 1-1-3 and तत्तु समन्वयात् 1-1-4). Belvalkar further writes, 'It seems then, at any rate, probable that the original Chāndogya B.S. has undergone two radical overhaulings: first when the 'prātiśākhīya' Brahmasūtra was enlarged in scope so as to be a 'sarvaśākhīya' text giving a harmonious interpretation of the teaching of the Upaniṣads as a whole and secondly by the addition of the controversial matter and in particular the Tarkapāda (2-2) meant to carry the warfare into the enemy's own territory. In the present state of our knowledge we can probably say what sūtras must have belonged to the original Chāndogya B.S. but cannot positively assert which ones did not belong to the same, except of course, in the most general way already indicated. And as to the middle or the penultimate version, we should be justified in excluding from it such sūtras, as we can, on independent philological grounds, prove as interpolations. One such clear case I mentioned 2-3-11-53 which is taken up by a discussion of the nature and functions of 'Tvam' or the individual self and which is interposed between sūtras syntactically related to one another, and parity of reasoning would lead us to suspect the discussion on

the nature of 'Tat' or the Supreme Self (Sūtras 11-41) placed at the end of chapter 3-2.'[1]

Thus Belvalkar has presented a very interesting but highly controversial and thought-provoking theory regarding the Brahmasūtra. P.V. Kane does not agree to this theory and criticises in the following words, 'Dr. Belvalkar postulates the proposition viz. that there were Brahmasūtras written separately for the C.U. and the B.U. and other Upaniṣads, for each Śākhā and secondly that the Śārīrakasūtra of Jaimini was bodily incorporated within and forms the main part of the contents of the present text of the Brahmasūtra. The present author takes strong objections to both these propositions. He cannot go into this question at length here, but has to remark that these propositions are based on little evidence. If *Janmādyasya yataḥ* was also a sūtra of Jaimini, who was specially connected with the Sāmaveda by the Mahābhārata and Purāṇas, why is it that the sūtra is supposed by the Bhāṣyakāras as based on a passage of the T.U.? The Chāndogya and the B.U. are each nearly thrice as long as all the other eight Upaniṣads (out of the principal ten Upaniṣads) and six times longer than the T.U. Therefore, these two Upaniṣads figure largely in the discussions in the extant B.S. The second proposition is hardly more than a pure guess. There is no evidence to establish that the main part of the extant Vedānta-sūtra is bodily taken from Gemini's Śārīrakasūtra. When the latter has not come down to us and when no sūtras therefrom (other than the two noted above) are quoted anywhere as from Gemini's Śārīraka sūtra.'[2]

S.M. Bhatkhande has examined the thesis by Belvalkar in greater detail and come to the conclusion that 'it would not be quite correct to say that the majority of the texts discussed in the present B.S. hail from the C.U. only. It has already been shown that the contribution from the other Upaniṣads is equally significant, if not more. It has also been pointed out how without these Upaniṣads, the philosophy of the B.S. would not be complete.'[3]

---

1. Belvalkar S.K., Basu Mallik Lectures on Vedānta, pp. 140.149
2. Kane P.V., History of Dharmaśāstra Vol. V, part-II pp. 1175-76
3. Bhatkhande S.M., The Chāndogya Upaniṣad and Brahmasūtra of Bādarāyaṇa, pp. 259-260

Thus whatever may be the ultimate outcome of the controversy raised by Belvalkar, it seems certain that the text of the B.S. need not be taken as a settled one. Though Bhatkhande has tried to controvert the thesis of Belvalkar, or presenting in a statistical and tabular form, the impression does persist with the reader as A.V.N. Sharma observes 'In most of the sections, the contribution of the C.U. is often 50% or more and as such C.U. the most important contributor to the B.S.'[1] So in order to correctly interpret and ascertain the meaning of the B.S., it is essential that we should have the definitive text of the B.S.; and so long as it is not there, a student of the B.S. is bound to encounter some of the above mentioned difficulties.

As noted above, tradition and sometime lack of tradition has handed down these difficulties.

As noted above, if the tradition presented some difficulties in understanding the Brahmasūtras, tradition has also supplied some solutions to the difficulties provided one knows correctly how to apply these solutions. And one of the sources of such solutions is the Mīmāṁsā Sūtras. They are regarded as presenting the rules and interpretation of the Vedic texts. As S.N. Dasgupta says 'The Mīmāṁsā sūtras deal mostly with the principles of the interpretation of the Vedic texts in connection with sacrifices'[2]

So we are justified if we seek help from the Pūrvamīmāṁsā Sūtras in determining the meaning of the Brahmasūtras which are meant to present the teaching of the Upaniṣads. At least that can be one of our valuable aids.

But before we do so, we may try to sort out or at least understand the knotty problem of chronology of these two Śāstras viz. Pūrvamīmāṁsā and the Uttaramīmāṁsā. The Jaiminis sūtras are designated as Pūrvamīmāṁsā which may give the impression that they are predecessors in point of time, to the Uttaramīmāṁsā. But as Radhakrishnan puts it. 'The Pūrvamīmāṁsā is so called because it is earlier (pūrva) than the Uttaramīmāṁsā, not so much, in the chronological as in the logical sense'.[3] Or as

1. Sharma A.V.N., Brahmavidyā– The Adyar Library Bulletin, Vol. 46, 1982.
2. Dasgupta S.N., A History of Indian Philosophy, Vol. 1, p. 372
3. S. Radhakrishnan, Indian Philosophy Vol. II, p. 374

Maxmuller suggests Pūrva in Pūrvamīmāṁsā does not necessarily indicate priority in time, or Uttara in Uttaramīmāṁsā does not mean posteriority in time. But this sequence might have come in vogue on the basis of the lifestages. A man has to pass through rituals before he realises the true nature of Ātman.[1]

But this fact cannot be utilised to prove the precedence of the Pūrvamīmāṁsā because Jaimini quotes Bādarāyaṇa as Bādarāyaṇa quotes Jaimini. But Maxmuller seems to be assigning priority to the Uttaramīmāṁsā as he says, 'while Bādarāyaṇa begins his sūtras with '*Athāto Brahmajijñāsā*'. 'Now therefore, the desire of knowing, Brahman'. Jaimini apparently in imitation of it, begins with '*Athāto Dharmajijñāsā*'. 'Now, therefore, the desire of knowing Dharma or duty'.[2] But if the Uttaramīmāṁsā, according to Maxmuller is to be regarded as preceding the Pūrvamīmāṁsā, he does not explain how the Brahmasūtras could quote Jaimini the author of the Pūrvamīmāṁsā sūtras.

Maxmuller's supposition is further rendered untenable by Belvalkar who put forward the thesis that some of the Brahmasūtras were composed by Jaimini and they were incorporated in the body of the present Brahmasūtra. He avers (If then) we are justified in assuming that Jaimini wrote a Śārīrakasūtra which sought to harmonise the teaching of the Sāmaveda Upaniṣads (and particularly of the Chāndogya) and that his Śārīrakasūtra was bodily incorporated within and forms the main part of the contents of the present text of the Brahmasūtra.[3] According to this theory Jaimini preceded Bādarāyaṇa. In fact, according to Belvalkar, the first Brahmasūtra Athāto Brahmajijñāsā was composed by Jaimini, contrary to what Maxmuller supposed.

Ganganatha Jha has tried to explain the problem in this manner, 'Lastly as regards Mīmāṁsā and Vedānta', there has never been any justification for regarding them as 'Pūrva' (preliminary) Mīmāṁsā and Uttara (final) Mīmāṁsā. We are alive to the fact that later on differences between the two systems cropped up regarding small details, but there has never arisen any

1. F. Maxmuller, The Six Systems of Indian Philosophy, p. 197
2. Ibid., p. 199
3. S.K. Belvalkar, Basu Mallik Lectures on Vedānta, p. 142

controversy on the main issues. The Vedānta finds its ultimate sanction in the Vedic texts, and as regards the authority of the Vedas, it accepts the conclusions of the sister system. For all practical purposes, the Vedāntin accepts the tenets of the Mīmāṁsā - hence the saying *Vyavahāre Bhaṭṭanyāyaḥ* current among writers on Vedānta. The above facts also account for the designation of Mīmāṁsā proper as Pūrva and that of the Vedānta as Uttara. For the enquiry into Brahman - Brahmajijñāsā and this enquiry can be carried on only on the basis of Vedic texts, it is necessary that the authority and reliability of the Veda should be established beyond doubt and then, that certain methods of interpreting these texts should be elaborated in order to prevent confusion in course of the study of the vastness of Vedic material. These two requirements have been met by Mīmāṁsā proper, and , on the basis of this Pūrva-preliminary Mīmāṁsā, the Vedāntin has raised the edifice of the Vedanta proper called on that account, the Uttara-final, Mīmāṁsā.[1]

The most cogent explanation seems to be forthcoming from P. Shastri in his book 'Introduction to the Pūrvamīmāṁsā'. He states 'There is a long established tradition that Jaimini who was a disciple of Bādarāyaṇa composed the Pūrvamīmāṁsā sūtras. We must not ignore this tradition unless we obtain some strong evidence against it. It is not absurd to assume Jaimini was a worthy disciple of Bādarāyaṇa, that Bādarāyaṇa had discussed various problems with him and that at the time of writing his sūtras, he referred to the views of Jaimini. Only one such discussion is found embodied in a sūtra of Jaimini, while others are not found. This omission may be explained by assuming that Jaimini did not like to embody these discussions in his sūtras or that he put them in some other works of his which are not extant. We are particularly assuming here only one thing viz. the possibility of the existence of some other works of the same Jaimini and this is certainly preferable to assuming that there were many Jaiminis and that there were many works of them, which have perished in course of time.'[2]

---

1. Ganganatha Jha, Śābarabhāṣya Vol. III, Introduction, VIII - IX
2. P. Shastri, Introduction to the Pūrvamīmāṁsā, p. 33

So the mystery of Bādarāyaṇa quoting Jaimini and Jaimini returning the compliment[1] is resolved to some extent by supposing that both these persons were contemporaries.

Now we can understand properly the interdependence of the Pūrvamīmāṁsā and the Uttaramīmāṁsā. As noted earlier, Pūrvamīmāṁsā deals with the principles of interpretation or as Othmar Gachter terms it as the Science of Hermeneutics.[2]

Understanding the Brahmasūtras means partly interpreting them too. Pūrvamīmāṁsā deals with the sacrifices and hence, it is quite natural that, their illustrations for interpreting will be from the domain of literature, dealing with the sacrificial matters. But the principles for understanding and interpreting the texts are sound and applicable to any text even one not dealing with the rituals.

As the Śābarabhāṣya states at the very outset लोके येष्वर्थेषु प्रसिद्धानि पदानि तानि (सति सम्भवे) तदर्थान्येव सूत्रेष्वित्यवगन्तव्यम् नाध्याहारादिभिरेषां परकिल्पनीयोऽर्थः परिभाषितव्यो वा। एवं वेदवाक्यान्येव एभिर्व्याख्यायन्ते इतरथा वेदवाक्यानि व्याख्येयानि स्वपदार्थाश्च व्याख्येयाः प्रयत्नगौरवं प्रसज्येत।

'The words of the sūtras are, as far as possible, to be understood in the same sense as they are known to convey in common parlance; it is not right to assume meanings for them on the basis of elliptical and other devices - or to attribute to them any special technical signification. It is only in this way that all that would have to be done would be to explain the Vedic texts directly (with the help of the sūtras), otherwise (if we did not take up the words of the sūtras in their ordinary sense) it would be necessary for us to explain the extraordinary (technical) meanings of the words of the sūtras themselves and then the texts of the Veda. This would involve great exertion.'[3]

The Pūrvamīmāṁsā Sūtras have enunciated some principles which are to be applied to the texts in interpreting and understanding them. The foremost of them, apart from occasional discussion at other places is the principle laid down in the sūtra

---

1. F. Maxmuller, The Six Systems of Indian Philosophy, p. 198
2. Othmar Gachter- Hermenautics and Language in Pūrva Mīmāṁsā –A Study in Śābarabhāṣya, The Title itself.
3. Tr. Ganganatha Jha, Śābarabhāṣya Vol. I.

(3-3-14). Among Statement, Import, Sentence, Topic, Position and Appellation, that which follows is weaker than that which precedes - because it is more removed from the original meaning. So according to this sūtra, the preceding one is stronger than the succeeding one and Śruti श्रुतिलिङ्गवाक्यप्रकरणस्थानसमाख्यानां समवाये पारदौबल्यमर्थविप्रकर्षात्। is the first and hence the strongest proof as it precedes all others viz. liṅga etc. Śābarabhāṣya, as such does not elaborate on the sūtra as can be seen from the bhāṣya on it. But the later compendium dealing with the basis of the Pūrvamīmāṁsā are more explicit on this count and we may take help from one such, the Arthasaṁgraha, one of the most popular manuals of the Pūrvamīmāṁsā, written by Laugākṣi Bhāskara.

According to the Pūrvamīmāṁsā, Vedas are fivefold विधि, मन्त्र, नामधेय, निषेध, अर्थवाद -i.e. Injunction, Incantation, Designation, Prohibition and Missionary Assertion.[1] Further विधि is fourfold उत्पत्तिविधि, विनियोगविधि, अधिकारविधि and प्रयोगविधि Injunction of Origination, Injunction of Subservience, Injunction of Competence and Injunction of Performance. Further there are six means of the proof assisting an injunction of this kind.

It would serve the cause of clarity if we quote A.B. Keith from his excellent work 'The Karmamīmāṁsā'. 'In dealing with injunctions of application, there are six means by which the relations of subordination actions etc. may be determined. The first and most important indication is express declaration, thus, if the injunction is given to use in honour of the Gārhapatya fire, a Mantra to Indra, this declaration (Śruti) prevails over the normal conclusion that a verse to Indra must come in a ceremony in his honour. Second in importance is indirect implication (liṅga), thus it is a rule in the Soma sacrifice that the juice used is to be consumed when therefore a Mantra (T.S. 3-2-5-1) is found which seems merely to refer to the drinking, it must be assumed that it covers, by its reference to drinking, all the operations connected with that action, such as the taking up of the potion, examining it, drinking it and digesting it'. Thirdly, syntactical connection is of value, thus in one passage (S.B. 4-4-6-16-18) we are able to decide that Ṛc and Yajuṣ mean the Ṛgveda and the Yajurveda, and not as might else be thought, metrical and prose Mantras,

---

1. S.S. Sukthankar, Arthasaṁgraha, p. 116 (Text)

because of the 'Syntactical Connection' with the immediately preceding words. Fourthly, context (prakaraṇa) is of great importance. We have the general injunction that one should perform the new and full moon sacrifices, and the injunction to offer to Tanunapāt, this principle enables us to find a purpose for the latter offering in connection with the former sacrifices; mere syntactical connection would not here help, as the sentences stand apart and are in themselves quite complete. Fifthly, order (krama) or position (Sthāna) is of service; thus in one passage (T.S. 1-6-2-4) occur three Mantras without indication of use, we can, however, by finding that elsewhere three offerings are enjoined in connection with three mantras, assume that the order of the sacrifices and the Mantras is to correspond one being used with each offering in order. Finally name (Samākhyā) may supply information otherwise wanting. Thus, Mantras, not otherwise identified by being styled Hautra are known to fall within the sphere of the Hotṛ priest. Each of these means for adequate reasons is deemed to be of more value than the preceding'.[1]

Further प्रयोगविधि - Injunction of performance enjoins क्रम order between the अङ्गs themselves. How is this order to be determined? Again there are means of proof to determine the order namely श्रुति, अर्थ, पाठ, स्थान, मुख्य and प्रवृत्ति- statement, purpose, Text, Seriatim, Juxtaposition, the Principals and continual performance. And there is a discussion in great details in the Arthasaṁgraha. The Śruti means of proof is twofold: that specifying pure sequence –that sequence (तद्विशिष्टपदार्थपरम्), वेदं कृत्वा वेदिं करोति is an instance of the first kind of Śruti and वषट्कर्तुः प्रथमभक्ष- (केवलक्रमपरम्) and that specifying a matter qualified by the first draught pertains to the Vaṣaṭkartṛ is an illustration of the second kind. This श्रुति proof is stronger than the other means of proof.

The second is अर्थ. Order by purpose exists in cases where the sequence is determined on the basis of the purpose. The instance of this proof is अग्निहोत्रं जुहोति, यवागूं पचति। One should offer Agnihotra, one should cook the barely gruel.

The third means of proof is पाठ. The order in which the sentences conveying different matters (relating to sacrifice) are given is order by Text seriatim. And on the basis of it, the order

1. A.B. Keith, Karmamīmāṁsā 1978, pp. 89-90

of such matters is decided. When we study the Veda, we study it in the order in which it is handed down. Naturally enough, we apprehend the sense of the different वाक्यs also in the same order in which we study them. As performance of the sacrificial acts is dependent upon the apprehension of the sense of the Vedic passages relating to them, it follows that we perform the acts in the order in which we apprehend the sense and this is the same as the order of the Veda. So ultimately it is the पाठक्रम that determines the अनुष्ठानक्रम. Then this text is again twofold मन्त्रपाठ and ब्राह्मणपाठ. And naturally मन्त्रपाठ is stronger than the ब्राह्मणपाठ.

The next is स्थानम् - juxtaposition. Juxtaposition is position in proximity. Sometimes we determine the sequence between two कर्मन्s (पदार्थ) in the विकृतियाग on the basis of the close proximity between them in the प्रकृतियाग. Thus it will be seen that स्थानप्रमाण functions in the विकृतिs where we determine the sequence between two कर्मन्s on the basis of the close proximity seen between them in the प्रकृति. The instance cited is that of the साद्यस्क्रयाग. It is a विकृति of ज्योतिष्टोम and as such borrows by अतिदेश the ज्योतिष्टोम इतिकर्तव्यता with certain modifications from the प्रकृति ज्योतिष्टोम. In the अनुबन्ध्य are sacrificed the अग्नीषोमीय, सवनीय and victims on the औपवस्थ्य, सुत्या and अवभृथ days respectively. In the साद्यस्क्र they are sacrificed on one and the same day and not on three different days. The day chosen for their immolation is the सुत्या day, which in the प्रकृतियाग belongs to the सवनीयपशु. The reason for this choice is, in the first instance, the intimate connection (प्रत्यासत्ति) of the सुत्या day with सोम which is pressed on that day. As साद्यस्क्र is a सोमयाग it is but natural that we should fix our choice on the Soma Pressing Day (सुत्या) ratner than on any other, औपवस्थ्य and अवभृथ being comparatively remote from सोम.

Again by choosing the middle day, we effect a relative uniformity of sequence. Naturally the question arises, if अग्निषोमीय, आश्विनग्रहण, सवनीय and अनुबन्ध्य are to be indicated on the same day (सुत्या), in what order, should they be immolated? It is here that the स्थानप्रमाण guides us as follows. In the प्रकृति i.e. ज्योतिष्टोम is performed on the सुत्या day, the सवनीय sacrifice (सवनीयानुष्ठान) immediately after आश्विनग्रहण (the offering of the Aśvin cup). In other words सवनीयानुष्ठान is प्रथममुपस्थित after आश्विनग्रहण. In the विकृति साद्यस्क्र also आश्विनग्रहण takes place according to the अतिदेश or चोदकवाक्य. So it is but natural that in the विकृति after आश्विन, we

would perform first सवनीयानुष्ठान to be followed by the अग्नीषोमीयानुष्ठान and आनुबन्ध्यानुष्ठान. Thus what enables us to judge the sequence between सवनीयानुष्ठान on the one hand and अग्नीषोमीयानुष्ठान and अनुबन्ध्यानुष्ठान. on the other is the close proximity between आश्विनग्रहण सवनीयानुष्ठान in the प्रकृति, in other words स्थान.

The next proof is the मुख्यक्रम: - Order of the Principals. In the प्रधानक्रम we perform the अङ्गs in the same order in which the प्रधानकर्मs are performed. Thereby we secure the same amount of proximity between the different प्रधानs and their अङ्गs, become equal in all cases. If we were to perform the अङ्गs in an order different from the one observed in the performance of their प्रधानs, the अङ्गs of some प्रधानs will come too close to their प्रधान s (अत्यन्तमव्यवधानम्) while the अङ्गs of other प्रधानs will be too far removed from their प्रधान s. And the latter would come in the way of the proximity (प्राशुभावसाहित्य) understood from the प्रयोगविधि.

This can be seen from the following instance. In the दर्शपूर्णमासौ आग्नेययाग is to follow ऐन्द्रयाग. According to मुख्यक्रम an अङ्ग of आग्नेययाग will have to be performed first and that of ऐन्द्रयाग next.

This will keep equal distance between आग्नेययाग and its अङ्ग on the other. If we were to perform ऐन्द्रअङ्ग first and आग्नेय अङ्ग next, आग्नेयअङ्ग and आग्नेययाग will come too close, the series being ऐन्द्रअङ्ग - आग्नेययाग - ऐन्द्रयाग while ऐन्द्रअङ्ग and ऐन्द्रयाग will be removed too far and thus प्रयोगप्राशुमाप will be vitiated.

The last means of proof is the प्रवृत्तिक्रम: order in continual performance. Order in continual performance is the order of the second and the following matters which is based upon the order of the matter alone first, when the subsidiaries converging towards principals which are performed by repetition. This being last, is the weakest of all means of proof.

These are, broadly speaking, the principles of interpretation laid down by the Pūrvamīmāṁsā.

It will be observed that Uttaramīmāṁsā accepts these principles when the occasion demands. But from this it does not follow that the Uttaramīmāṁsā is dependent upon the Pūrvamīmāṁsā. We have already dealt with the question of priority and posteriority of these two mīmāṁsās. So the Uttaramīmāṁsā must have absorbed these principles from an

atmosphere in which these principles of interpretation must have been very much in vogue. In fact, Parimala, a commentary on the Kalpataru which itself is a commentary on the commentary Bhāmatī on the Brahmasūtra is explicit on this point. Parimal commentary runs thus: पूर्वतन्त्र इवात्रापि शास्त्रे वेदे प्रामाण्यादीनि सूत्रितान्येव। अत एव च नित्यत्वम् (ब्र. सू. 1-3-29) इति हि वेदप्रामाण्यं सूत्रितम्।

नानाशब्दादिभेदात् (ब्र. सू. 3-3-58) इति शब्दान्तरादिकं, शब्दादेव प्रमितः (ब्र.सू. 1-3-24). आकाशस्तल्लिङ्गात् (ब्र.सू. 1-1-22). तथा चैक वाक्यतोपबन्धात् (ब्र.सू. 3-4-24) प्रकरणात् (ब्र. सू. 1-3-26) इत्यादिभिः श्रुतिलिङ्गादिकं, श्रुत्यादिबलीयस्त्वाच्च न बाध (ब्र. सू. 3-3-49) इत्यादौ श्रुतिलिङ्गादिबलाबलं, विपर्ययेण तु क्रम (ब्र. सू. 2-3-14) इत्यादिभिरपेक्षितं क्रमप्रमाणजातं, अतिदेशात् च (ब्र. सू. 3-3-46) तथा चैक वाक्यतोपबन्धात् (ब्र.सू. 3-4-24) प्रकरणात् (ब्र. सू. 1-3-26) इत्यादिभिः श्रुतिलिङ्गादिकं, श्रुत्यादिबलीयस्त्वाच्च न बाध (ब्र. सू. 3-3-49) इत्यादौ श्रुतिलिङ्गादिबलाबलं, विपर्ययेण तु क्रम (ब्र. सू. 2-3-14) इत्यादिभिरपेक्षितं क्रमप्रमाणजातं, अतिदेशात् च (ब्र. सू. 3-3-46) इत्यतिदेशप्रमाणमित्येतत्सर्वं सूत्रितमेव। भाष्यकारादिभिः स्फुटीकर्तव्यता तु पूर्वतन्त्रसूत्रेष्वपि समाना।....आचार्यैस्तु श्रुतिलिङ्गादयः पूर्वतन्त्रे निरूपिता इत्येतावदुक्तं नत्विह तदपेक्षा अस्तीति।[1]

Here (in the Uttaramīmāṁsā) also the authoritativeness of the Vedic texts forms the subjectmatter of the Sūtras as in the Pūrvamīmāṁsā. The Sūtra अत एव नित्यत्वम् (ब्र. सू. 1-3-29) establishes the authoritativeness of the Vedic texts. The sūtra नानाशब्दादिभेदात् (ब्र.सू. 3-3-58) deals with the difference of words etc. The sūtras शब्दादेव प्रमितः (ब्र.सू. 3-4-24) प्रकरणात् (ब्र.सू. 1-3-6) श्रुत्यादिबलीयस्त्वाच्च न भेदः (ब्र. सू. 3-3-49) etc. ascertain the principles of Śruti (direct texts), liṅga (import) etc. and their respective value. The sūtra विपर्ययेण तु क्रमः (ब्र.सू. 2-3-94) etc. show how to determine the order of various things. The sūtra अतिदेशाच्च (ब्र.सू. 3-3-46) establishes the rule of transference. So the Uttaramīmāṁsā deals with many of the topics of the Pūrvamīmāṁsā.

---

1. ब्रह्मसूत्रशाङ्करभाष्यम्- NSP, 1938, p. 64.

But leaving aside the dependence of any Mīmāṁsā upon the other, it seems certain that the Uttaramīmāṁsā has absorbed some of the principles codified in the Pūrvamīmāṁsā. These principles must have been in vogue before they came to be enshrined in the Pūrvamīmāṁsā sūtras. This abovequoted passage, though gainsays the dependence of the Uttaramīmāṁsā upon the Pūrvamīmāṁsā, makes clear the absorption of some of the concepts and ideas of the Pūrvamīmāṁsā. Bhāṣyakāras on the B.S. too also occasionally point out the absorption of such ideas of the Pūrvamīmāṁsāśāstra. Śaṅkara in his bhāṣya on the Brahmasūtra. अनुबन्धादिभ्यः प्रज्ञान्तरपृथक्त्ववद्दृष्टश्च तदुक्तम् (3-3- 50) refers to Jaimini sūtra (J.S.) कत्वर्थायामिति चेन्न वर्णत्रयसंयोगात् (जै.सू. 1-4-7) Then on अक्षरधियां त्ववरोधः सामान्यतद्भावाभ्यामौपसदवत्तदुक्तम् (ब्र.सू. 3-3-33) refers to गुणमुख्यव्यतिक्रमे, तदर्थत्वान्मुख्येन वेद संयोगः (जै.सू. 3-3-8).

Then again Śaṅkara in his bhāṣya on the न चाधिकारिकमपि पतनानुमानातदयोगात् (ब्र.सू. 3-4-41) and उपपूर्वमपि त्वेके भावमशनवत्तदुक्तम्। (ब्र.सू. 3-4-42) refers to अवकीर्णपशुश्च तद्वदाधानस्यात्प्राप्तकालत्वात् (जै.सू. 6-8-21), समा विप्रत्तिपत्तिः स्यात् (जै.सू. 1-3-8), and शास्त्रस्था वा तन्निमित्तत्वात्। (जै.सू. 1-3-9) respectively. Jaimini, by name, is referred to, in all, ten B.S.s. viz.

1. साक्षादप्यविरोधं जैमिनिः। (1-2-28)
2. संपत्तेरिति जैमिनिस्तथा हि दर्शयति। (1-2-31)
3. मध्वादिष्वसंभवादनधिकारं जैमिनिः। (1-3-21)
4. धर्म जैमिनिरत एव। (3-2-40)
5. शेषत्वात्पुरुषार्थवादो यथाऽन्येष्विति जैमिनिः। (3-4-2)
6. परामर्शं जैमिनिरचोदना चापवदति हि। (3-4-18)
7. तद्भूतस्य तु नातद्भावो जैमिनेरपि नियमात्तद्रूपाभावेभ्यः। (3-4-40)
8. परं जैमिनिर्मुख्यत्वात्। (4-3-12)
9. ब्राह्मेण जैमिनिरुपन्यासादिभ्यः। (4-4-5)
10. भावं जैमिनिर्विकल्पामननात्। (4-4-11)

Of course, the matter dealt with in these sūtras is not found discussed in the Jaiminisūtras except the matter of the ब्र.सू. ब्राह्मेण जैमिनिरूपन्यासादिभ्यः (4-4-5) But that is altogether a different proposition.

Apart from the direct references to Jaimini to his sūtras, there is an identity of the usage of certain terms which both the mīmāṁsās use in an identical manner. For example श्रुति, लिङ्ग etc. are the most obvious terms used in an identical way. Occasionally there is a usage of the word दर्शयति which in J.S. like the B.S. also means the Śruti, as in the sūtra प्रत्ययं चापि दर्शयति (J.S. 2-4-30). Veda also points to the same idea (of the Act being one and the same). Of course, दर्शन is also used in the sense of finding in the Pūrvamīmāṁsā as in the sūtra (J.S. 1-1-23) Also because we find indicative texts or in the sūtra अनित्यदर्शनाच्च (J.S. 1-1-28). Also because we find ephemeral. It may also be noted that अनुमान is rarely found used in the J.S. One of the cases is the famous sūtra विरोधे त्वनपेक्ष्यं स्यादसति ह्यनुमानम् (1-3-3). Then again in अनुमानव्यवस्थानात् things (mentioned in the Veda) or in the sūtra (J.S. 4-3-4). Also because we find motives. तत्संयुक्तं प्रमाणं स्यात्। (1-3-15) and in its adjectival form तस्या वाऽप्यानुमानिकमविशेषात्। (J.S. 10-8-14). The word स्मृति or its forms are also nowhere found used in the J.S.

CHAPTER - 2

MODERN HISTORICOCRITICAL METHOD OF INTERPRETING THE BRAHMASŪTRA

As we have just seen earlier, the principles of interpretation enunciated by the Pūrvamīmāṁsā have been accepted and utilised by the Brahmasūtras. So the Pūrvamīmāṁsā is one of the sources of understanding and ascertaining the meaning of the Brahmasūtras.

There were also some other principles evolved to interpret the texts in ancient times. These principles are summarised in the following verse-

उपक्रमोपसंहारावभ्यासोऽपूर्वता फलम्।
अर्थवादोपपत्ती च लिङ्गं तात्पर्यनिर्णये।।[1]

In deciding the import of a text, (1) The beginning of the text (2) the end of it (5) repetitions (4) novelty (5) ultimate object (6) explanatory passage and (7) reasoning are the points to be considered.

These principles were also fairly prevalent and taken into consideration while deciding the meaning of the text.

Further apart from these principles evolved in ancient times, in modern times also, scholars have made several attempts to understand the import of the Brahmasūtras. On finding the principles of olden times not fully sufficient in understanding the Brahmasūtras they have tried to apply the modern critical method which may be termed as 'historiocritical method'. Among these modern scholars is P.M. Modi who has made a splendid attempt at understanding a part of the Brahmasūtra. He has some suggestions to offer for the method of interpretation. P.M. Modi does accept the utility of the ancient principles but at the same time looking to the fact that by applying the same principles the commentators have come to different conclusions, he believes these ancient principles are not sufficient.

---

1. The Sarva Darśana Saṁgraha of Mādhavācārya, ed. by Umashankar Sharma, p. 770

Moreover, P.M. Modi does not believe that the sūtras were meant to be omnifaced (विश्वतोमुखम्) in the sense of being capable of being interpreted in various *senses ad libitum*. It is never possible, he asserts, that the Sūtrakāra should have more than one system in his mind. The sūtras are not written in the style of works like the Rāghavapāṇḍavīyam so that they could be interpreted in favour of both the Kevalādvaita of Śaṅkara and the Dvaita of Madhva.

P.M. Modi also lays down some don'ts in order to get at the original meaning of the sūtras. He says, we should not proceed by asking ourselves 'How far Śaṅkara truly represents the view of the author of the Brahmasūtra?' Nor should it be from the very start our object to see which, if any, of so many interpretations, has faithfully represented the natural and straight forward meaning of the original. Nor, even, should we begin our work by putting before us the question, 'How far does the author of the Brahmasūtra represent correctly the views of the chief Upaniṣads' According to P.M. Modi these and similar questions can be satisfactorily solved only at a later stage. Such questions should be taken up only after fixing the sense of the Brahmasūtra as a whole.

According to P.M. Modi, the first stage should be that of studying the sūtras intensively and internally. Instead of going from Upaniṣads to the sūtras, as most probably the earlier ācāryas did or instead of going from Upaniṣads, the Gītā and one or two Purāṇas to the sūtras, as was done by some of the later ācāryas, or also instead of going from the commentators to the Sūtrakāra as modern scholars have done, we should go from the Sūtrakāra to the Upaniṣads. After the necessary preliminary knowledge of the Brahmasūtra, we should repeatedly read only the sūtras and when we get some idea of the sense of a sūtra from its context etc., we should consult the Upaniṣads in order to find out the Śruti referred to by the sūtra. We should for the time being, set aside, the belief in the unanimity (ekavākyatā) of the three prasthānas, in the correctness of the commentary of any particular ācārya, and also in the form in which we have been accustomed to think of this unanimity from our preliminary study. We should first try to go deep into the sūtras themselves and only at a second stage should we reopen and consult a commentary or commentaries.

If this line of research is adopted, we should, according to P.M. Modi, take up the following points for study.

(1) We should inquire whether the Sūtrakāra in the course of his work, anywhere refers to what he himself has said in the preceding portion of his work itself. We meet with several (about eight in number) sūtras in which we find the expression तदुक्तम् 'It has been said'. By comparing what has been on the same problem in the foregone portion of the Brahmasūtra, we should try to make out whether the reference is to the Brahmasūtra or to any other work. According to P.M. Modi, तदुक्तम् always refers to what the Sūtrakāra himself has said in the respective earlier portion of his work. [1]

(2) Further a study of the references made in the Bahuvrīhi compounds might also help us since the author may refer to his own work by such compounds आनन्दादय: - in B.S. 3-3-11, सत्यादय: in B.S. 3-3-38 and आयतनादय: in B.S. 3-3-39 refer to आनन्द in B.S. 1-1-2, सत्यसंकल्प in the śruti discussed in B.S. 1-2-1 and द्युभ्वाद्यायतन in B.S. 1-3-1 and that the three groups of thoughts expressed by the three Bahuvrīhi compounds are respectively those collected by the Sūtrakāra, in the first, second and the third pādas of the first adhyāya. As a result of this identification not only do we get the correct sense of the sūtras 3-3-11, 38-39, but we also get the original plan of the Sūtrakāra in the arrangement of the V.V. of the B.S. 1-1-3. 1-1 discusses only those śrutis which deal with the अरूपवत् aspect of Brahman, B.S. 1-2 those which deal with the same but use words applicable to the पुरुष aspect also, and B.S. 1-3 those texts which deal with the पुरुष aspect but use terms applicable to the अरूपवत् aspect also.

One more instance is that of शब्दादि in B.S. 3-3-58 (नाना शब्दादिभेदात्) which seems to us to mean शब्द, प्रकरण, संज्ञा and mentioned in B.S. 3-3-6 to 8 (अन्यथात्वं शब्दादिति चेन्नाविशेषात् न वा प्रकरणभेदात् परोवरीयस्त्वादिवत् and संज्ञातश्चेत्तदुक्तमस्ति तदपि)। The sūtrakāra establishes the collection (in the case of meditation on Brahman) on the ground that the meaning or the purpose is the same (उपसंहारोऽर्थभेदात् B.S. 3-3-5) and rejects the three arguments of the

---

1. Vide the Table given on p. 295 of his A Critique of the Brahmasūtra Part II.

pūrvapakṣa based upon the भेद of शब्द, प्रकरण and संज्ञा while in the case of the अङ्गावबद्धाः ब्रह्मोपासनाः (B.S. 3-3-55), he accepts the same arguments and says that these meditations are different from one another.

Śaṅkara takes शब्दादि to mean शब्द गुण etc.

(3) Then according to P. M. Modi, we should always compare and contrast the statements in the various sūtras both as regards the words used and the sense conveyed in them, without of course neglecting the context. Let us first take up the comparison of the same words used in different sūtras.

(i) In B.S. 3-3-11 (आनन्दादयः प्रधानस्य) we have the word which Śaṅkara explains as Brahman, and as he says 2.7 that आनन्द etc. are the धर्म of प्रधान we may conclude that he takes प्रधान in his sense of सगुण ब्रह्मन्. Now if we compare this sūtra with B.S. 3-2-14 (अरूपवदेव हि तत्प्रधानत्वात्) we learn that प्रधान according to the Sūtrakāra is the chief or main nature or aspect of Brahman and the word is used by him in the sense of अरूपवत् or निराकार (not निर्गुण ब्रह्मन्). By an investigation for the correct text of the Brahmasūtra, P.M. Modi has also shown that the same word occurs also in B.S. 3-3-43 which should be read as प्रधानवदेव तदुक्तम् instead of प्रधानवदेव तदुक्तम्. Thus प्रधान in all the three passages is used in the sense of the अरूपवत् or निराकार aspect of Brahman.

Similarly P.M. Modi compares the word स्थान used in the sūtras स्थानतोऽपि परस्योभयलिङ्गं सर्वत्र हि। (B.S. 3-2-11), सन्ध्ये सृष्टिराह हि। (B.S. 3-2-1) and स्थानविशेषात् प्रकाशादिवत् (B.S. 3-2-34).

Similarly P.M. Modi compares the word उपसंहार in the sūtras उपसंहारोऽर्थाभेदाद्विधिशेषवत्समाने च। (3-3-5) कृत्स्नभावात्तु गृहिणोपसंहारः (3-4-48) and उपसंहारदर्शनान्नेति चेन्न क्षीरवद्धि (2-1-24). According to P.M. Modi, thus उपसंहार does not mean the उपसंहार of the attributes (which are not referred to in that Sūtra) from one śruti to another śruti on the same Lore, but it means the collection of all the information about the meditation on Brahman from the various Upaniṣads for the purpose of practising that meditation.

Similarly P.M. Modi examines the word अप्राप्ति in the sūtras प्रियशिरस्त्वाद्यप्राप्तिरूपचयापचयो हि भेदे (B.S. 3-3-12) प्रतिसंख्याऽप्रतिसंख्या निरोधाप्राप्तिरविच्छेदात् (B.S. 2-2-22) and in समुदाये उभयहेतुकेऽपि तदप्राप्तिः (B.S. 2-2-18) According to P.M. Modi, from the context it

appears that the Sūtrakāra excludes them from the list of attributes of Brahman to be used in the meditation on Brahman (3-3-14). So अप्राप्ति would mean non-acceptance for the purpose of meditation even in the Taittirīyaka Branch (referring to Śaṅkara प्रियशिरस्त्वादीनां धर्माणां तैत्तिरीयकाम्नातानां नास्त्यन्यत्र प्राप्तिः।

(4) Further we should also study the synonyms of the prominent words in the Brahmasūtra. According to P.M. Modi, the सूक्ष्म in Brahmasūtra, i.e. सूक्ष्मं तदर्हत्वात् (1-4-2) stands for अरूपवत् in B.S. अरूपवदेव हि तत्प्रधानत्वात् (3-2-14) and that मुख्यम् in B.S. परं जैमिनिर्मुख्यत्वात् (3-4-12) is a synonym 2.9 of प्रधान in B.S. अरूपवदेव तत्प्रधानत्वात् (3-2-14).

(5) Further we should compare several expressions in different parts of the sūtras and we may get some important suggestions about their interpretation. P.M. Modi gives some examples. We should compare, P.M. Modi says, (एकस्यामपि in B.S. भेदान्नेति चैन्नैकस्यामपि (B.S. 3-3-2) with B.S. अङ्गावबद्धास्तु न शाखासु हि प्रतिवेदम्। (3-3-55). We get the double suggestion that एकस्यामपि means एकस्यापि शाखायाम् and that sūtra 3-3-2 lays down a condition about the teaching of Brahman being common to all the Vedāntas or Vedāntas of all the Vedas, while B.S. 3-3-55 mentions the conditions why the teaching of अङ्गावबद्धाः ब्रह्मोपासनाः is not to be collected in the Branches of other Vedas than in the particular Veda in which they occur.

Similarly अर्थाभेदात् in 3-3-5 (उपसंहारेऽर्थाभेदाद्विधिशेषवत्समाने च) should be compared with अभेदात् in B.S. 3-3-19 (समाने एवं च भेदात्). By this comparison we come to know that 3-3-19 means अर्थाभेदात् and that समाने means 'in a similar text' i.e. in a Vedānta text.

(6) Then P.M. Modi favours a comparison of the doctrinal statements. He gives some examples of it. इयदामननात् (B.S. 3-3-34) and भूतग्रामवत्स्वात्मनः। (B.S. 3-3-35) should be compared with: अर्भकौकस्त्वात्तद्व्यपदेशाच्च नेति चेन्न निचाय्यत्वादेवं व्योमवच्च। (B.S. 1-2-7) अल्पश्रुतेरिति चेत्तदुक्तम्। (B.S. 1-3-21) हृद्यपेक्षया तु मनुष्याधिकारत्वात्। (B.S. 1-3-25) and शब्दादिभ्योन्तः प्रतिष्ठानाच्च नेति चेन्न तथा दृष्ट्युपदेशादसंभवात्पुरुषमपि चैनमधीयते। (B.S. 1-2-26).[1] We thereby understand the sense of sūtras 3-3-34, 35, viz. because the प्रधान and the पुरुष are said to be of the limited size of the heart for the purpose of meditation on

1. Śaṅkara has a variant reading of the sūtra.

them as such, one should carry out the meditation on Brahman inside one's own self like (the meditation on) the group of elements. All the four passages teach the inward method of meditation on and पुरुष.

Further, according to P.M. Modi the following sūtras may be compared with one another. आत्मगृहीतिरितरदुत्तरात्। (B.S. 3-3-16). आत्मेति तूपगच्छन्ति ग्राहयन्ति च। (B.S. 4-1-3), शास्त्रदृष्ट्या तूपदेशो वामदेववत्। (B.S. 1-1-30). From the comparison we learn that sūtra 3-3-16 does not aim at explaining आत्मन् in आत्मा वा इदमेक एवाग्र आसीत्। (Ai. U 1-1) as परमात्मन् (as Śaṅkara says) but that आत्मगृहीत explains the अहंग्रह method (अहं ब्रह्मास्मि) of meditation on Brahman and that Sūtra 4-1-3 tells us that those who have been carrying out the means (for the knowledge of Brahman) mentioned in B.S. 3-34 but have not yet realised Brahman, when repeatedly returning to this world approach Brahman as their own self and make others understand it similarly. So Sūtra 3-3-16 explains the means of meditation on Brahman and sūtra 4-1-3 tells as what the advanced seeker does when he returns to this world for perfection.

Similarly P.M. Modi seeks to compare the sūtras अङ्गेषु यथाश्रयभावः। (B.S. 3-3-61), न वा तत्सहभावाश्रुतेः। (B.S. 3-3-65) and आदित्यादिमतयश्चाङ्ग उपपत्तेः। (B.S. 4-1-6)

(7) Like comparison, a contrast between some sūtras also helps us in deciding the sense of the sūtras. In अरूपवदेव हि तत्प्रधानत्वात्। (B.S. 3-2-14) Brahman is explained as chiefly अरूपवत् or निराकार while in B.S. 1-2-23 (रूपोपन्यासाच्च) the Sūtrakāra argues that the topic of the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad (M.U.) 1-1-5-6 is पुरुष because the figure or आकार is mentioned in M.U. 2-1-3. Thus we have a clear proof that according to the Sūtrakāra, Brahman is both निराकार and साकार, and that the favour is the chief aspect. A contrast between these sūtras helps us also in interpreting the word प्रधान in तत्प्रधानत्वात् and in other sūtras प्रधान means chief or main, so that the रूपवत् aspect is also admitted by the sūtrakāra, though the अरूपवत् aspect is the chief aspect. From this we can also conclude that Śaṅkara is not justified in adding वाक्यानि to the sūtra (अरूपवदेव हि तत्प्रधानत्वात्)। इत्येवमादीनि वाक्यानि निष्प्रपञ्च-ब्रह्मात्मतत्त्वप्रधानानि नार्थान्तरप्रधानानि।

Again we should contrast अर्थाभेदात् in B.S. 3-3-5 (उपसंहारोऽर्थाभेदात्) with अर्थभेदात् in B.S. 3-3-25 (वेधाद्यर्थभेदात्). From

the contrast, we learn that in the latter sūtra, the Sūtrakāra gives us an example of the absence of उपसंहार, that he bases उपसंहार and अनुपसंहार on the identity and non-identity of the subject (अर्थ) viz. Brahman that sūtra 3-3-25 is a पूर्वपक्षसूत्र that sūtra 3-3-26 हानौ तूपायनशब्दशेषत्वात्कुशाच्छन्दस्तुत्युपगानवत्तदुक्तम्। is a सिद्धान्तसूत्र and lastly that this latter sūtra refers to B.S. 3-3-5 (उपसंहारोऽर्थाभेदाद्विधिशेषवत् समाने च)। through the word तदुक्तम्.

(8) Above all, the context is the most important factor to be considered in interpreting the sūtras. According to P.M. Modi, the various interpretations of the ācāryas have been possible mostly on account of the neglect of the context. It is the context by the help of which we can decide what words should be taken as implied or understood (अध्याहार) in a Sūtra. Śabara, as we have seen also complained of the additions made by commentators which were not in agreement with the context. The context, if strictly followed also helps us in fixing the number of sūtras in each adhikaraṇa and thereby in reconstructing the original Sūtrapāṭha. P.M. Modi gives several examples of it.

B.S. 3-2-11 to 19. These are very important sūtras because they deal with the exact nature of Brahman, according to the Sūtrakāra. On account of Śaṅkara's explanation of स्थान in sūtra 11 (न स्थानतोऽपि परस्योभयलिङ्गं सर्वत्र हि) they have been doubted as an interpolation. But on the strength of the context, we have shown that स्थान here means the three or four states जागरितस्थान, स्वप्नस्थान etc. and that here the sūtrakāra rejects a view which explains that the निराकार and साकारश्रुति about ब्रह्मन् refer to different states of Brahman. He establishes the view that Brahman is in all states both निराकार and साकार. B.S.s 3-3-19-24. If, we, according to P.M. Modi strictly follow the context, it appears that in these sūtras, the sūtrakāra gives his view that only the Vedāntas i.e. the Upaniṣads are the authority for the Love of Brahman. He clearly says that though there are some passages in the Saṁhitās, Brāhmaṇas, and Āraṇyakas in which the attributes of Brahman are mentioned, he should distinguish between the पूर्वकाण्ड and उत्तरकाण्ड because the śrutis like M.U. 1-1, C.U. VII-1 make this distinction. This important piece of information was overlooked because the strict contextual sense of अन्यत्र, अपि, विशेष, इतर in these sūtras was not followed and as a result there came to be a wrong division of the adhikaraṇa in course of time.

Further P.M. Modi examines the context of the sūtras. B.S. 3-4-18 to 28, 3-4-41, 42, 3-4-43 to 46, 4-2-7 to 14 and 4-2-15.

(9) P.M. Modi makes a practical suggestion regarding the question of discovering the exact context, in the case of certain words when they occur in the sūtras. In these cases we must follow the context strictly as these words can never be taken as referring to something not stated in the immediately preceding sūtra or adhikaraṇa.

(i) अत: or अत: एव in sūtra 3-2-26 should refer to अव्यक्त mentioned in sūtra 23 (तदव्यक्तमाह हि 13-2-23) but Śaṅkara takes it to mean स्वाभाविकत्वादभेदस्य अविद्याकृतत्वाच्च भेदस्य which is a reference to a quotation given by Śaṅkara in his commentary an Sūtra 3-2-25.

अत: in B.S. 3-3-23 :(संभृतिद्युव्याप्त्यपि चात:) should refer to the विशेष mentioned in the preceding two sūtras. Śaṅkara takes it as referring to आयतनविशेषयोगात् which is a reference to a quotation given by Śaṅkara in his explanation of the preceding Sūtra.

अत: in B.S. 3-3-41 should be taken as referring to some word in the preceding sūtra (3-3-40 आदरादलोप:)। but Śaṅkara takes it as तस्मादेव भोजनद्रव्यात् which is mentioned in the Śruti quoted by Śaṅkara in his bhāṣya on the preceding sūtra.

(ii) The word पूर्व should always be interpreted as a reference to what has immediately preceded. पूर्ववत् in B.S. 3-2-29 refers naturally to the example in sūtra 27 and is meant to give preference to that example over the example in Sūtra 28. But Śaṅkara takes it to refer to his interpretation of Sūtra 25.

पूर्वविकल्प: in sūtra 3-5-4, 45 (पूर्वविकल्प: प्रकरणात्स्यात्क्रिया मानसवत्) is a reference to the option given in sūtra 3-3-28 (छन्दत उभयाविरोधात्) and the subsequent sūtra preceding sūtra 44. But Śaṅkara explains it as क्रियामयअग्नि which if mentioned is what he thinks to be the विषयवाक्य of the preceding sūtra.

तद् in B.S. 3-3-44 (लिङ्गभूयस्त्वात्तद्धि बलीयस्तदपि)। should refer to प्रधान (or प्रदान according to Śaṅkara's pāṭha प्रदानवदेव तदुक्तम्)। in the preceding sūtra, but Śaṅkara takes it as referring to लिङ्ग in sūtra 44 itself. तद् in B.S. 3-3-42 (तन्निर्धारणानियमस्तद्दृष्टे: पृथग्ध्यप्रतिबन्ध: फलम्)। refers to the question of the विशेषण of प्रधान and पुरुष discussed in B.S. 3-3-37 to 41 or it should refer to some word in sūtras 40-41. But Śaṅkara takes it to refer to तानि

उग्दीथादिकर्मगुणयाथात्म्यनिर्धारणानि निर्धारणानि– which are given in the śruti which Śaṅkara takes it as the विषयवाक्य of sūtra 42. तद् in sūtra 4-2-17 (तदोकोग्रज्वलनम्) should refer to the पर or the Supreme One in the heart mentioned in the preceding sūtra, but Śaṅkara takes it to refer to the individual soul who is not mentioned in the preceding sūtra or Adhikaraṇa. As a result of this he has to say that sūtras 15-16 (4-2-15 तानि परे तथा ह्याह and 4-2-16 अविभागो वचनात्। 4-2-16) deal with परा विद्या while sūtra 17 deals with अपरा विद्या. (iv) Expressions like अन्यथा, अन्यथात्वम्, अन्यत्र, अन्य etc. should always refer to the reverse of what is said in the preceding sūtra.

अन्यथात्वम् in B.S. 3-3-6 (अन्यथात्वं शब्दादिति चेन्नाविशेषात्। should mean the absence of the उपसंहार which is mentioned in the preceding sūtra, but Śaṅkara- takes it as ᐧ: युक्तं विद्यैकत्वम् with reference to a पूर्वपक्ष about a śruti which he takes as a विषयवाक्य of sūtra 3-3-6.

In this case, अन्यथात्वम् also shows that sūtra 5 should belong to the same अधिकरण as sūtra 5.

अन्यथा in B.S. 3-3-36 (अन्यथा भेदानुपपत्तिरिति चेन्नोपदेशान्तरवत्)।

should mean if not within one's self (or it should refer to some word in the sūtras interpreted by Śaṅkara), but Śaṅkara takes in the sense of अनभ्युपगम्यमाने विद्याऽभेदे, i.e. the reverse of the conclusion he wants to prove in the preceding sūtra which is, of course, to be taken as implied.

अन्यत्र in B.S. 3-3-10 (सर्वभेदादन्यत्रेमे) should mean other than अभेद (in सर्वाभेदात् in the sūtra) or in भेद but Śaṅkara takes it to refer to Śrutis other than the one which is the विषयवाक्य according to him.

अन्यत्र in B.S. 3-3-20 (सम्बन्धादेवमन्यत्रापि) should mean elsewhere than in the similar text i.e. in a dissimilar text (समाने sūtra 19), but Śaṅkara takes it in the sense of another section of the same topic as the one in the Śāṇḍilyavidyā which he takes as discussed in the preceding sūtra. By adding (एवं जातीयके विषये) - Śaṅkara has, in fact, reversed the sense of अन्यत्र.

इतर in sūtra 3-3-16 should refer to the other of two (प्रधान and पुरुष meant in sūtra 3-3-10) i.e. to पुरुष because प्रधान is mentioned in sūtras 11-15. But Śaṅkara takes इतर as referring to other śrutis about creation than the one which he takes as the विषयवाक्य of sūtra 16. In fact इतर throughout refers to the aspect of Brahman

other than the one mentioned in the particular sūtra, but Śaṅkara takes it in various ways e.g. इतरवत् in sūtra 3-3-37 व्यतिहार: विशिंषन्ति हीतरवत्।

इमे and other pronouns should also refer to some word or words in the preceding sūtras.

इमे in B.S. 3-3-10 (सर्वभेदादन्यत्रेमे) refers to the two mentioned in sūtra 3-3-8 संज्ञातश्चेत्तदुक्तमस्ति तु तदपि but Śaṅkara takes it as referring to इमे वसिष्ठत्वादयो गुणा: in his भाष्य of sūtra 10.

(v) Another important word the sense of which must be interpreted strictly according to the context is अपि 'also'. This word shows that what has preceded is to be included in or added to what follows.

अपि in B.S. 3-2-11 न स्थानतोऽपि परस्योभयलिङ्गं सर्वत्र हि। should go with परस्य. In the case of the individual soul, the three states were proved to be not able to explain the twofold condition of बन्ध and मोक्ष in the preceding sūtras. Now the sūtrakāra says that these states do not explain the application of the twofold śrutis to the supreme one also. So the states explain the nature neither of the individual soul nor of the Para. But Śaṅkara takes स्वत: एव as understood and connects अपि with it. (न ह्येकं वस्तु स्वत: एव रूपादिविशेषोपेतं तद्विपरीतं चेत्यवधारयितुं शक्यं विरोधात्। अस्तु तर्हि स्थानत: पृथिव्याद्युपाधियोगादिति। तदपि नोपपद्यते)।

अपि in B.S. 3-4-32 विहितत्वाच्चाश्रमकर्मापि। shows that the seeker of liberation should perform the duties of his order in addition to other duties mentioned in sūtra 27, but Śaṅkara takes मुमुक्षु as the topic of the preceding sūtras (26, 27) and in the case of sūtra 32, he says अमुमुक्षोरप्यश्रममात्रनिष्ठस्य....

कर्तव्यान्येव नित्यानि कर्माणि. Thus he takes अपि with अमुमुक्षु who is neither expressly stated nor implied in the preceding sūtras

अपि in sūtra 3-4-41 न चाधिकारिकमपि पतनानुमानात्तदयोगात्। should refer to अतद्भाव: (तद्भूतस्य तु न अतद्भाव: न च, तद्भूतस्य अधिकारिकमपि कर्म) but Śaṅkara says : यद्यप्यधिकारलक्षणे निर्णीतं प्रायश्चित्तं तदपि न नैष्ठिकस्य भवितुमर्हति।

(10) As already said, the अध्याहार to be taken in any sūtra should depend solely upon the context of the sūtra and never upon anything else, like the विषयवाक्य or the division of परा and अपरा विद्या etc. which is not mentioned in the sūtra. By the very fact of its being a sūtra, there are bound to be some gaps in any sūtra

whatever. And the interpreter's right of filling up these gaps should be exercised as rarely as possible, and only in rigid agreement with the sūtra itself. It is mainly by a wrong use of this right that one and the same sūtra can be interpreted in more than one way, unless the sūtra is composed of double meaning words like, the verses with the figure of speech called śleṣa.

P.M. Modi has also made some useful suggestions regarding the text of the Brahmasūtra which would help in the division of the adhikaraṇas.

About the particle हि P.M. Modi says, this particle seems to have 'throughout in the Brahmasūtra the sense of because' and for this reason, it is evident that then sūtra in which हि occurs, should always supply an argument for the assertion in the same sūtra or in a preceding one. This would lead to a corollary that the sūtra with हि cannot begin a new adhikaraṇa. P.M. Modi cites some sūtras in support of his statement. In the following sūtras, हि supplies an argument for the proposition in the same sūtra in which it occurs.

(i) न स्थानतोऽपि परस्योभयलिङ्गं सर्वत्र हि। B.S. 3-2-11

(ii) तदव्यक्तमाह हि। B.S. 3-2-23

(iii) प्रियशिरस्त्वाद्यप्राप्तिरुपचयापचयौ हि भेदे। B.S. 3-3-12

(iv) परामर्शं जैमिनिरचोदना चापवदति हि B.S. 3-4-18 and so on. Then the word तथाहि is also similarly used in the following sūtras :

(i) अतोऽनन्तेन तथाहि लिङ्गम्। B.S. 3-2-26

(ii) सांपराये तर्तव्याभावात्तथा ह्यन्ये। B.S. 3-3-27

(iii) विकारावर्ति च तथाहि स्थितिमाह B.S. 4-4-19

Then there are certain sūtras with हि which supports a proposition in a preceding sūtra.

(i) अरूपवदेव हि तत्प्रधानत्वात्। B.S. 3-2-14 supports the proposition न स्थानतोऽपि परस्योभयलिङ्गं सर्वत्र हि। of B.S. 3-2-11

(ii) उर्ध्वरेत: तु च शब्दे हि। B.S. 3-4-17 supports the statement in sūtra 3-4-8 अधिकोपदेशात्तु बादरायणस्यैवं तद्दर्शनात्।

(iii) अतोऽन्यापि ह्येकेषाम्। --B.S. 4-1-17 contains an argument for अग्निहोत्रादि तु तत्कार्यायैव। --in B.S. 4-1-16.

Then similarly P.M. Modi studies the use of तु in the sūtras. According to him, the usual sense of the particle तु is 'but' and it signifies the rejection of an opponent's view (pūrvapakṣa) and

that the sūtra in which it occurs is a siddhānta sūtra. In this sense the word occurs in the following sūtras : (i) सामान्यात्तु। (B.S. 3-2-32) The pūrvapakṣa is stated in the preceding sūtra 3-2-31 परमत: सेतून्मानसंबन्धभेदव्यपदेशेभ्य:। and Śaṅkara rightly explains तु as तु शब्देन प्रदर्शितां प्राप्तिं निरुणद्धि।

(ii) पूर्वं तु बादरायणे हेतुव्यपदेशात्। (B.S. 3-2-41) The pūrvapakṣa is given in the preceding sūtra (धर्मं जैमिनिरत एव)। (iii) संज्ञातश्चेत्तदुक्तमस्ति तु तदपि। (B.S. 3-3-8). Here Śaṅkara, according to P.M. Modi seems to interpret तु in the sense of च 'which is evidently wrong'. Here तु means the refutation of a pūrvapakṣa stated partly in a preceding sūtra न वा प्रकरणभेदात्परोवरीयस्त्वादिवत्। (3-3-7) and partly in this sūtra.

P.M. Modi further examines the copulative particle च in the sūtras. He states that importance of च in this respect would be numerically far more than that of any other particle because in about 227 sūtras (from 3-2-11 to 4-4) the particle च occurs about 80 times.

The particle च has its usual sense of addition in the following sūtras (i) 3-2-13 (अपि चैवमेके) अपि च shows that this sūtra adds one more argument to the sūtrakāra's reply to

न भेदात् चेन्न प्रत्येकमतद्वचनात्। (3-2-13) (ii) च in the sūtra

दर्शनाच्च 3-2-21 adds a śruti as an argument वृद्धिह्रास भाक्त्वमन्तर्भावादुभयसामञ्जस्यादेवम्। (3-2-20) and so on.

P.M. Modi writes 'According to Śaṅkara with whom we agree the particle च in these sūtras adds one more argument (युक्ति) to that already given in a preceding sūtra or adds a śruti as an argument or shows the further application of a proposition.'[1]

In certain sūtras च performs a double function that of adding a final argument so that these sūtras show the end of an adhikaraṇa as well as the addition of one more argument to those already given e.g. प्रतिषेधाच्च (3-2-30) विशेषं च दर्शयति। (4-3-16) and so on.

After an examination of many sūtras P.M. Modi comes to the conclusion that the use of च in the B.S. would prove that (1) when a sūtra begins with च, most probably it is not the first or only sūtra of an adhikaraṇa and (ii) When a sūtra with if occurs in the course of an adhikaraṇa, it generally signifies the last argument

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra Part II p. 327.

for the point in question and often in this case the sūtra is the last sūtra of the adhikaraṇa, though not always so.

Further, P.M. Modi emphasizes the study of the grammatical construction of certain sūtras. The most prominent among these sūtras with words in the ablative case having the sense of 'reason' e.g. sūtra 4-3-5 उभयव्यामोहात्तत्सिद्धेः। gives the हेतु for sūtra 4-3-4 आतिवाहिकास्तल्लिङ्गात् In this case the हेतुसूत्र is like a sūtra with हि i.e. it is by itself incomplete in sense and gives only a reason for the conclusion in a preceding sūtra which may present the pūrvapakṣa or the siddhānta.

According to P.M. Modi the हेतुसूत्र with ablative case should not be taken as the first sūtras of an adhikaraṇa.

Moreover, P.M. Modi further discusses the characteristics of the first sūtra of an adhikaraṇa. He states that generally the first sūtra of an adhikaraṇa is not in the form of a but it makes an assertion, which is a selfcomplete and easily comprehensible statement of a view and which may or may not be accompanied by a हेतु. The sūtra 3-2-11 contains the proposition of न स्थानतोऽपि परस्योभयलिङ्गम् and one argument viz. सर्वत्र हि.

On these grounds, P.M. Modi has tried to fix the pāṭha of each adhikaraṇa of the portion from 3-2-11 to 4-4-22.

CHAPTER - 3

VIṢAYAVĀKYAS OF THE BRAHMASŪTRA IN GENERAL

The Brahmasūtra is a Vedānta-text. Vedānta is accepted as a synonym of the Upaniṣads, which are among the revealed texts or Śruti. The Brahmasūtra is meant to interpret Upaniṣadic texts especially those in respect of which there is likely to be a controversy regarding their meaning and to show that all the texts have a synthetic meaning free from mutual contradiction. It is also meant to present the purport of the Upaniṣads in respect of the final aim (puruṣārtha) i.e. emancipation (mokṣa) and the means reaching to it. The Upaniṣads are called Jñāna-kāṇḍa the portion dealing with Supreme knowledge Vedānta, as against the Brāhmaṇas which constitute the Karmakāṇḍa, the portion dealing with rituals.

The Brahmasūtra is also called Uttaramīmāṁsā sūtra obviously in reference to the Pūrvamīmāṁsā sūtra. There is a tradition regarding both the mīmāṁsās as one entire work. Pūrvamīmāṁsā has got 12 chapters and the Uttaramīmāṁsā has 4 chapters, so refering to the total 16 chapters of the mīmāṁsās

Rāmānuja avers to the unity of both the mīmāṁsās by stating-

कर्मब्रह्ममीमांसयोरैकशास्त्र्यम् and quotes Baudhāyana सहितमेच्छारीरकम् जैमिनीयेन षोडशलक्षणेनेति शास्त्रैकत्वसिद्धिः[1]

But the Pūrvamīmāṁsā deals with the Karmakāṇḍa portion of the śruti and the Uttaramīmāṁsā deals with the Jñāna-kāṇḍa portion of the śruti i.e. the Upaniṣads, and Śaṅkara is apt to regard the two as two seperate Śāstras. If the Brahmasūtras deal with the Upaniṣads, then naturally the Upaniṣads would be their sourcebooks. Moreover the sūtras of Bādarāyaṇa represent an attempt to systematise and harmonise the Upaniṣadic texts. Deussen says, 'The Śārīraka-mīmāṁsā or Uttaramīmāṁsā or as it is mostly called from its source Vedānta of Bādarāyaṇa which unites the contents of the Upaniṣads in a theologico-Philosophical system.'[2]

---

1. Rāmānuja, Śrībhāṣya, ed. by Karmarkar R.D., p. 3
2. Deussen, The System of the Vedānta, p. 4.

Further T.G. Mainkar writes 'To the sūtrakāra the Upaniṣads are the Vedānta-texts for he is seen using the word Vedānta in the sense of Upaniṣads as in the sūtra सर्ववेदान्तप्रत्ययं चोदनाद्यविशेषात्। (B.S. 3-3-1) It would appear that the Mīmāṁsā of Bādarāyaṇa was closely allied to the Mīmāṁsā of Jaimini and Bādarāyaṇa attempted to do in respect of the Upaniṣads, the Vedānta texts what Jaimini had done in respect of the earlier texts, the Brāhmaṇas and the like that deal with the sacrifice.'[1]

So it is certain that the Brahmasūtras is a Vedānta text-book and Vedānta means Upaniṣads, The Brahmasūtras attempt at systematising the philosophy of the Upaniṣads. So the Upaniṣads, are a constant source of reference to the sūtras. This leads us to another conclusion that the viṣayavākyas of the Brahmasūtras, whatever they be, would be expected to be from the Upaniṣads. S.N. Dasgupta writes, 'A study of the extant commentaries on the Brahmasūtras of Bādarāyaṇa by the adherents of different schools of thought leaves us convinced that these sūtras were regarded by all as condensation of the teachings of the Upaniṣads.'[2] But to be fair, we must take a note of dissent, voiced by B.N.K. Sharma presenting the views of Madhva. He writes, 'The sūtras of Bādarāyaṇa are the earliest aphoristic manual of the system of Vedānta that has come down to us. Their internal evidence shows that there had been other attempts to codify the speculations of the Vedic and Upaniṣadic texts and systematise their teachings. Jaimini, Bādari, Āśmarathya, Auḍulomi and Kaśakṛtsna are some of the authors quoted in the sūtras of Bādarāyaṇa. And we do not know if any, or all of them had covered the entire field of metaphysical system-building or had merely confined their attention to some aspects thereof. Madhva holds that Bādarāyaṇa's work is wider in range and that these authors were in fact disciples who developed particular aspects of his thought and that his object in referring to their views was to give them publicity and that there is no conflict of views between him and these authors. Even a cursory examination of the sūtras will show that they have collected their data from a wide range extending from the Vedic to the postvedic sources, not excluding the Smṛtis,

---

1. T. G. Mainkar, The Making of Vedānta, p. 57
2. S.N. Dasgupta, A History of Indian Philosophy Vol. I p. 433

Itihāsa, Purāṇas and have discussed them under appropriate heading. They have tried to formulate and expound a fullfledged system of Vedānta which will be free from contradictions of thought and conflicts with evidence that may be possibly felt or raised from within the sacred literature itself. Such a definitive, critical and comprehensive exposition of the Vedānta system which even the author of the Gītā felt worthy of honourable mention (B.G. 13-4) can hardly be denied the title of Nirṇāyaka Śāstra at least so far as the followers of the Vedānta system are concerned. Such a description would naturally raise the question of the scope of the sūtras-whether it should be extended to the Vedic and post-vedic literature as well, or be confined to the ten or twelve Upaniṣads alone. Śaṅkara has taken the latter view on the basis of which he has explained the sūtras as a systematisation of the philosophy of the Upaniṣads (aupaniṣadam darśanam). His influence has predisposed most of the other commentators who came after him to accept his view of restricting the samanvaya of texts carried out in the sūtras to the Upaniṣads alone. But the internal evidence of the sūtras and certain admission of Śaṅkara – himself in his commentary go to show that their scope as originally conceived by their author was much wider than the ten or twelve Upaniṣads and included the earlier and later phases of the sacred literature.'[1].

B.N.K. Sharma, in support of his contention, cites the commentary by Śaṅkara on the the sūtra Śāstrayonitvāt (BS. 1-1-3) in which Śaṅkara takes the word Śāstra in the sense of Ṛgvedādiḥ - the Ṛgveda and others - the others referring according to his (i.e. Śaṅkara's) commentator – Vācaspati to the rest of the fourteen Vidyāsthānas.[2] This meaning of the śāstra, B.N.K. Sharma further points out, is also retained by Śaṅkara in the second interpretation of the sūtra. So, B.N.K. Sharma, comes to the conclusion. 'It follows from this that the whole of the Śāstra consisting of the Ṛgveda and others and not only the Upaniṣads when properly interpreted with the help of the principles formulated in the Samanvayādhyāya and elsewhere in

1. B. N. K. Sharma, The Brahmasūtras and Their Principal Commentaries, Vol. 1, pp. 1-3
2. Vide the relevant portion of the commentary on the Śāṅkarabhāṣya

the sūtras is competent to give us the correct knowledge of Brahman.....'

We have many scattered references to numerous Vedic Śākhās including Khila Śrutis and non-extant sources in the sūtras of Bādarāyaṇa even according to Śaṅkara's own showing (2-3-43, 3-3-55,56). These are sufficient to establish the fact that viṣayavākyas (texts embodying the subject-matter of dissussion) and other relevant particulars for building up certain adhikaraṇas have been drawn by the sūtrakāra for pre-Upaniṣadic sources. Aso on several occasions post-Upaniṣadic and Purāṇic sources including Smṛtis and Dharmaśāstras are also found to be utilised by the sūtrakāra especially in adhyāyas 3 and 4.'[1]

Notwithstanding a forceful presentation of Madhva's view by B.N.K. Sharma, the evidence in the form of tradition is so overwhelming that we have to restrict the scope of the Brahmasūtra to the principal Upaniṣads as done by the available oldest commentator Śaṅkara.

P.M. Modi also writes 'One important fact which I have discovered is that the Sūtrakāra takes as authority for (the knowledge of) Brahman only the Vedāntas', i.e. the Upaniṣads and not the 'Saṁhitā, the Brāhmaṇa, the Āraṇyaka and the Khila (the Khilas of the Sāmaveda Rāṇāyanīya Śākhā)'. He does not consider the attributes of Brahman mentioned in these non-Upaniṣadic Śrutis as worthy of discussion in his Brahmasūtra though the attributes like Saṁbhṛti and dyuvyāpti (mentioned in the Rāṇāyanīya Khila of the Sāmaveda) are really the attributes of Brahman.[2]

Thus the Brahmasūtras draw upon the principal Upaniṣads and hence their viṣayavākyas would be from them.

The Brahmasūtras are divided into four chapters (adhyāya) and each of the chapter is divided into four pādas. Further each pāda is divided into adhikaraṇas (sections). Each adhikaraṇa consists of one or more sūtras depending on its topic under

---

1. B.N.K. Sharma, The Brahmasūtras and Their Principal Commentaries, Vol. 1, pp. 1-3
2. P.M. Modi, A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part 1, Introduction p. XIII

discussion. Each adhikaraṇa according to the commentators, takes up for consideration a viṣayavākya.

Viṣayavākya is, in fact, the mainstay of the five limbs of an adhikaraṇa as stated in the following verse

विषयो विशयश्चैव पूर्वपक्षस्तथोत्तरम्।
निर्णयश्चेति पञ्चाङ्गं शास्त्रेऽधिकरणं स्मृतम्।

Every adhikaraṇa has the following five limbs : (i) viṣaya - subject - matter (ii) viśaya - doubt or controversy (iii) pūrvapakṣa - the primafacie view (iv) uttarapakṣa - answer to an objection and (v) nirṇaya - conclusion

In the third pāda of the above verse, there are varient readings: सङ्गतिश्चेति पञ्चाङ्गम्। also प्रयोजनं च पञ्चाङ्गम् connection (सङ्गति) between different sections or the object (प्रयोजनम्) in view.

Now what is a viṣayavākya? To put it simply यद्विषयो निर्णयः कर्तव्यः स विषयः। यमधिकृत्य निर्णयः कर्तव्यः स विषयः।

to avoid the repetition of the term विषयः or अधिकरणावयवविशेषो विचारार्हवाक्यम्।

or it may also be explained as आपाततः प्रतीतसंदिग्धार्थो विषयः।

For the term viṣayavākya different renderings have been proposed by scholars. Radhakrishnan calls it 'text referred to' or 'relevant text' or simply the 'reference.'[1]

B.N.K. Sharma explains it as 'texts embodying the subject matter of discussion.'[2] E.A. Solomon explains the term as 'a Vedic sentence serving as a source for the philosophic topic under consideration.'[3]

Commentators straightaway refer to a v.v. by various expressions. Foremost of them Śaṅkara refers to v.v. saying श्रुतिनिर्देशस्तावत्। (Śāṅkarabhāṣya, B.S. 1-1-2) or एवं हि श्रूयते।

(S.B. B.S. 1-1-5) or इदमाम्नायते। (S.B. B.S. 1-1-20) and so on. Bhāskara, another commentator, writes in his commentary on the 1-1-2 sūtra अत एवेदं सूत्रमनुमानप्रदर्शनार्थं न भवति किन्तु वेदवाक्यदर्शनार्थम् किं पुनस्तद्। यतो वा इमानि...। Bhāskara generally directly gives the v.v. in

1. Radhakrishnan, Brahmasūtra, 1-1-1, 1-1-2 and 1-1-11.
2. B.N.K. Sharma, The Brahmasūtras and Their Principal Commentaries, p. 3
3. E. A Solomon, Brahmasūtra Śāṅkara Bhāṣya, Introduction, pp. 8-9

the beginning of an adhikaraṇa or a sūtra as in 1-3-24 (शब्दादेव प्रमितः) or in 1-3-22 अनुकृतेस्तस्य च।

अङ्गुष्ठमात्रः पुरुषो मध्य आत्मनि तिष्ठति। तथाङ्गुष्ठमात्रः पुरुषो ज्योतिरिवाधूमक ईशानो भूतभव्यस्य स एवाद्य स उ श्व एतद्वैतद् इति च श्रूयते। तत्र सन्देहः and so on.

and

न तत्र सूर्यो भाति न चन्द्रतारकं नेमा विद्युतो भान्ति कुतोऽयमग्निः तमेव भान्तमनुभाति सर्वं तस्य भासा सर्वमिदं विभातीति श्रूयते।

तत्र सन्देहः and so on.

Similarly Rāmānuja on 1-3-9 अक्षरमम्बरान्तधृतेः।

वाजसनेयिनो गार्गीप्रश्ने समामनन्ति स होवाचैतद्वैतदक्षरं गार्गि ब्राह्मणा अभिवदन्ति अस्थूलमनण्वह्रस्वमदीर्घमलोहितमस्नेहमच्छायम् इत्यादि।

or on 1-4-1

आनुमानिकमप्येकेषामिति चेन्न शरीररूपकविन्यस्तगृहीतेर्दर्शयति च।

कठवल्लीष्वाम्नायते इन्द्रियेभ्यः परा ह्यर्था अर्थेभ्यश्च परं मनः।

मनसस्तु परा बुद्धिर्बुद्धेरात्मा महान्परः। महतः परमव्यक्तमव्यक्तात्पुरुषः परः।

पुरुषान्न परं किंचित्सा काष्ठा सा परा गतिः।

and so on.

In this way, the commentators identify the v.v. of course, many a time in the light of the interpretation they put on the sūtra.

The crux of the problem is as to how to know for certain, that the v.v. as identified by a particular commentator, is the same, as the one intended by the sūtrakāra. The sūtra being very laconic generally does not give any hint about the v.v. which would help us in identifying the v.v. beyond any doubt. This is also one of the difficulties which make the interpretation of the Brahmasūtras a difficult task.

Radhakrishnan's perception of this difficulty is slightly different from that of other scholars. He writes, 'The commentators in spite of their different philosophical allegiances, do not vary mach with regard to the arrangement of the topics or the meaning of the sūtras or the reference to the sources or texts intended to be the viṣayavākyas.'[1]

To ascertain the v.v. intended by the sūtrakāra is very important because many times the interpretation of the sūtra

1. S. Radhakrishnan, The Brahmasūtra, Introduction p. 24.

depends upon the v.v. P.M. Modi writes 'But the interpretation of a sūtra which is intended by the sūtrakāra to refer to a śruti depends solely upon its viṣayavākya and so far the question of tracing the exact v.v. of a sūtra is of supreme importance.'[1] Srisachandra Vasu in his introduction to the English translation of the commentary of Baladeva on the B.S. observes, 'Being a work of exegetics, one would expect them to give reference to the passages which are being explained but there is hardly a single sūtra which gives unmistakable reference to any passage of the Upaniṣad. The result is that the various commentators have tried their ingenuity in finding out the passage of in imagining the text which is the subject of discussion. That they have not been consistent even on this broad point will be clear to any one who will study the various commentaries.'[2] If the situation is not so hopeful as Radhakrishnan portrays it to be, it is not so hopeless either as Srisachandra Vasu makes it out to be. Perhaps V.S. Ghate strikes a note of balance. He remarks, 'The fact that the Upaniṣad passages under discussion are not actually mentioned in the sūtra must also be considered in this connection. Different commentators may take up for discussion different passages and this one and the same adhikaraṇa may yield quite different meaning.[3]

As noted above, the commentators simply give the v.v. of a particular sūtra. As we know, sometime the commentators are inclined to be guided or even led away by their own philosophical persuasion and hence they are not likely to be objective in their reference to the v.v. Consequently their v.v. may not be the same as intended by the sūtrakāra. So in order to understand and interpret the Brahmasūtra correctly, it is necessary to reach to the sūtrakāra, and for this it is imperative to point out the v.v. intended by the sūtrakāra. But the question is as to how one could identify the v.v. originally envisaged by the sūtra.

P.M. Modi writes about the method of tracing the v.v. of a sūtra, 'When a Śruti which is the v.v. of a sūtra is to be found out, as a rule, we should expect that some word in the sūtra must be

1. Modi P.M. Critique of the Brahmasūtra, p. 240.
2. Baladevabhāṣya, Introduction p. 1
3. Ghate V.S., The Vedānta, p. 44

also present in the Śruti. An equally important point is that the sense of the Śruti and that of the sūtra should be the same. Neither of the two points should be given prominence over the other, otherwise, both the sense and the Śruti of sūtra would be mistaken. In finding out the v.v. of a sūtra we may have often to go through a hurried reading of all the accepted Upaniṣads which is only possible if there is already a preliminary study of these Upaniṣads.[1]

Thus sūtrakāra would be of some help in this matter. Occasionally, the Sūtrakāra is not averse to giving some hints regarding the v.v. of a sūtra. It would not be wrong if we start with the supposition that, as the sūtra aims at discussing some Upaniṣadic text it may contain some clue, either in the form of an expression or a word or a part of a word or a synonym or a verb or a formation of it, as Deussen calls it 'Catchword'.[2] So first of all, it would be prudent to look for such a catchword.

S.M. Bhatkhande has divided the sūtras into three classes, viz. (i) Opaque sūtras (ii) Translucent sūtras and (iii) Transparent sūtras.

(i) Opaque sūtras : These are the sūtras which do not afford any glimpse, through them, of the source behind. Some of them are given here : दर्शनाच्च (B.S. 3-1-20), दृश्यते तु। (B.S. 2-1-6), स्मरन्ति च (B.S. 2-3-47) and so on.

(ii) Translucent Sūtras : Occasionally the sūtrakāra paraphrases the original word, as for instance, when he uses caraṇa for pāda (ज्योतिश्चरणाभिधानात्। B. S. 1-1-24), bhū for pṛthivi (द्युभ्वाद्यायतनं स्वशब्दात्। (B.S. 1-3-1) and in the same sūtra sva for ātman; ambara for ākāśa (अक्षरमम्बरान्तधृतेः। B.S. 1-3-10), Kampana for ejati (कम्पनात्। B.S. 1-3-39).

(iii) Transparent sūtras : These are the sūtras which clearly indicate the v.v. They incorporate a part of the source-passage in the sūtras. The sūtrakāra often includes the most important word of the source-material in the sūtras. e.g. Vāmadeva, (B.S. 1-1-30 शास्त्रदृष्ट्या तूपदेशो वामदेववत्)। camasa, (B.S. 1-4-8 चमसवदविशेषात्)। Vaiśvānara (B.S. 1-2-24) वैश्वानरः साधारणशब्दविशेषात्)। Bhūmā (B.S.

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part II, p. 293
2. Deussen, System of Vedānta, p. 26

1-3-8 भूमा सम्प्रसादादध्युपदेशात्)। Caitraratha (B.S. 1-3-35 क्षत्रियत्वगतेश्चोत्तरत्र चैत्ररथेन लिङ्गात्)।

Ārambhaṇa (B.S. 2-1-14, तदनन्यत्वमारम्भण शब्दादिभ्य:) and so on. The sūtras in which these words occur are really transparent sūtras because the source of the sūtras in each case is obvious and can be easily traced even without the help of a commentary. Bhatkhande gives a list of such transparent sūtras which may be given here for ready reference.

Sūtras	Source
1. आनन्दमय: अभ्यासात्।	(1-1-12) Tai. U. 2-5
2. अन्त: तद्धर्मोपदेशात्।	(1-1-20) C.U. 1-6-6
3. आकाश:तल्लिङ्गात्।	(1-1-22) C.U. 1-9-1
4. अत एव प्राण:।	(1-1-23) C.U. 1-11-5
5. ज्योतिश्चरणाभिधानात्।	(1-1-24) C.U. 3-13-7
6. शास्त्रदृष्ट्या तूपदेशो वामदेववत्।	(1-1-30) Rv. 4-26-1 and B.V. 1-4-10
7. गुहां प्रविष्टावात्मानौ हि तद्दर्शनात्।	(1-2-11) Kaṭha U. 1-3-1
8. अन्तर्याम्यधिदैवादिषु तद्धर्मव्यपदेशात्।	(1-2-18) B.U. 3-7-3
9. वैश्वानर: साधारणशब्दविशेषात्।	(1-2-14) C.U. 5-18-1
10. भूमा सम्प्रसादादध्युपदेशात्।	(1-3-8) C.U. 7-3-1
11. सा च प्रशासनात्	(1-3-11) B.U. 3-8-9
12. दहर उत्तरेभ्य:	(1-3-14) C.U. 8-1-1
13. क्षत्रियत्वगतेश्चोत्तरत्र चैत्ररथैन लिङ्गात्।	(1-3-35) C.U. 4-3-5
14. ज्योतिर्दर्शनात्	(l-3-30) C.U. 8-12-3
15. योनिश्च हि गीयते।	(1-4-27) m.u. 3-1-3, 1-1-6
16. तदनन्यत्वमारम्भणशब्दादिभ्य:।	(2-1-14) C.U. 6-1-14
17. सप्तगतेर्विशेषितत्वाच्च।	(2-4-5) M.U. 2-1-8
18. कृतात्येऽनुशयवान्दृष्टस्मृतिभ्यां यथेतमनेवं च।	(3-1-8) C.U. 5-10-5
19. प्रियशिरस्त्वाद्यप्राप्तिरुपचयापचयौ हि भेदे।	(3-3-12) T.U. 2-5
20. यदेव विद्ययेति हि।	(4-1-18) C.U. 1-1-10
21. वाङ्मनसि दर्शनाच्छब्दाच्च।	(4-2-1) C.U. 6-8-6
22. अर्चिरादिना तत्प्रथिते:।	(4-3-1) b.u. 6-2-15

Of course, this classification [1] or this method of dividing the sūtras is not something new. Commentators also knew of such things and in fact, this is obtainable from their commentaries. Śaṅkara is aware of some such method. He writes in his commentary on the B.S. ईक्षतेर्नाशब्दम्। (c-1-5)

ईक्षतेरिति च धात्वर्थनिर्देशोऽभिप्रेतः यजतेरितिवत्। न धातुनिर्देशः। तेन यः सर्वज्ञः सर्वविद्यस्य ज्ञानमयं तपः।

तस्मादेतब्रह्म नाम रूपमन्नं च जायते।। (M.U. 1-1-9) इत्येवमादीन्यपि सर्वज्ञेश्वरकारणपराणि वाक्यान्युदाहर्तव्यानि। To explain : ईक्षते: refers to not only the actual words, etc. in the Upaniṣads but also the various meanings of the root ईक्ष् i.e. ज्ञा, विद् etc.

P. M. Modi has given much thought to this topic of viṣayavākya in his 'A Critique of the Brahmasūtra,' mostly with reference to Śaṅkara. He makes the following observations about Śaṅkara. 'Regarding the reference in the sūtras to śrutis, we find (i) that there are several sūtras which contain no reference to any śruti at all, and yet which Śaṅkara interprets as referring to some śrutis (ii) that there are some sūtras which refer to some śrutis but not to those which Śaṅkara takes them as referring (iii) and that there are a few sūtras which refer, to the sūtras themselves but, which Śaṅkara takes as referring to certain śrutis or to some other texts. We do not mean that Śaṅkara's Viṣayavākyas are always wrong. We must rather admit that almost all his Viṣayavākyas in B.S. adhyāya I and in several cases of B.S. adhyāyas 3 and 4, are wonderfully correct and that in the case of certain sūtras, it would have been almost impossible for a modern student to hit upon the exact v.v. out of the ocean of śruti literature, had not Śaṅkara (or his predecessor, if Śaṅkara in the particular case depended upon him) pointed out and preserved for us the correct śruti referred to in the sūtra, e.g. the śruti from the Khila of the Rāṇayaniya Śākhā quoted by Śaṅkara under B.S. 3-3-23. What we mean is that the task of finding out the exact v.v. of a sūtra had become very difficult even by the time of Śaṅkara who either says, though rarely, that he differs from his predecessor as regards the exact v.v. of a sūtra (e.g. B.S. 3-3-38) or gives two or more śrutis as optional v.v. for the same sūtra (e.g. B.S. 3-3-17 अन्वयादिति

1. Bhatkhande S.M., The Chāndogya Upaniṣad and The Brahmasūtras of Bādarāyaṇa, pp. 246-247

चेत्स्यादवधारणात्) । under such circumstances. Śaṅkara' s own v.v.s become doubtful and require careful attention before they are accepted.'[1]

P.M. Modi has also drawn his own conclusion which has a bearing upon the v.v.s of a part of the Brahmasūtras. He writes 'We have shown that आनन्दादय: in B.S. 3-3-11 (आनन्दादय: प्रधानस्य), सत्यादय: in B.S. 3-3-38 and आयतनादय: in B.S.3-3-39 refer to आनन्द in B.S. 1-1-12, सत्यसंकल्प in the śruti discussed in B.S. 1-2-1 (सर्वत्र प्रसिद्धोपदेशात्) and द्युभ्वाद्यायतन in B.S. 1-3-1 and that the three Bahuvrīhi compounds are respectively those collected by the sūtrakāra in the first, second and the third pādas of the first adhyāya. As a result of this identification, not only do we get the correct sense of sūtras 3-3-11, 38, 39 but we also get the original plan of the sūtrakara in the arrangement of the v.v. of B.S. 1-1- to 3. B.S. 1-1 discusses only those Śrutis which deal with the अरूपवत् aspect of Brahman. B.S. 1-2 those which deal with the same but uses words applicable to the पुरुष aspect also and B.S. 1-3 those texts which deal with the पुरुष aspect but use terms applicable to the अरूपवत् aspect also.'[2]

In addition to all these erudite considerations one may also devise a simple but sound common sense and yet scientific approach to ascertain the v.v. of a sūtra. And that approach is of the context. P.M. Modi has righty put much emphasis on the context (vide supra). But here by context is meant not only the context of the sūtras themselves (that P.M. Modi has emphasized) but of the Upaniṣads referred to as well. This can also help us in bringing out the correct v.v. of a particular sūtra. If we can determine the v.v. of an adhikaraṇa, then we should examine the context of the relevant portion of the Upaniṣad, corelating both the contexts together. If for an adhikaraṇa there is a particular portion from an Upaniṣad as a topic of discussion, then this should be also the case for the individual sūtras in an adhikaraṇa. To explain, the v.v. of the individual sūtras in that adhikaraṇa also should be from that portion of the Upaniṣad which form the topic of an adhikaraṇa. We should search for a v.v. from the same portion and if from that portion is not available, then from the

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part II, p. 239.
2. Ibid.

portion near it or from the same chapter and ultimately from the same Upaniṣad. This would appear to be more reasonable. Of course, commentators have mostly followed this rule. But sometime they deviate without any justification. To illustrate, it is beyond doubt that in the ईक्षत्यधिकरणम् (B.S. 1-1-5 to 11) the relevant portion from the Upaniṣad as a v.v. of an adhikaraṇa is सदेव सोम्येदमग्र आसीदेकमेवाद्वितीयम्.. ।... तदैक्षत बहु स्यां प्रजायेयेति। (C.U. 6-2-1) Now let us indicate the individual sūtras along with their v.v.s in the following manner.

1-1-5 ईक्षतेर्नाशब्दम्। सदैक्षत बहु स्यां प्रजायेयति। (CU. 6-2-3) 1-1-6 गौणश्चेन्नात्मशब्दात्। स आत्मा सदेव सोम्येदमग्र आसीत्। (CU. 5-1-1)

1-1-7 तन्निष्ठस्य मोक्षोपदेशात्— तत्त्वमसि श्वेतकेतो। (C.U. 6-8-7)

आचार्यवान्पुरुषो वेद, तस्य तावदेव चिरं यावन्न विमोक्ष्येऽथ संपत्स्ये। (C.U. 6-14-2)

1-1-8 हेयत्वावचनात्।

As no portion (of the Upaniṣads) states that Brahman should be shunned or abandoned. So this sūtra does not have a v.v.

1-1-9 स्वाप्ययात्। यत्रैतत्पुरुषः स्वपिति नाम सता सौम्य तदा

सम्पन्नो भवति स्वमपीतो भवति तस्मादेनं स्वपितीत्याचक्षते स्वं ह्यपीतो भवति। (C.U. 6-8-1)

In fact, this is the sūtra which really helps us to single out the C.U. VI passage from other similar with ई क्ष् root passages.

1-1-10 गतिसामान्यात्। Like C.U. the other Ups. state the same thing.

1-1-11 श्रुतत्वाच्च। This is common knowledge we get from Ups. in regard to the cause of the world. (1-1-10)

According to Śaṅkara this sūtra (1-1-10) means 'On account of the uniformity of the teaching (Brahman is to be treated as the cause).' Śaṅkara quotes passages from Kau.U. यथाग्नेर्ज्वलतः सर्वा दिशो विस्फुलिङ्गा विप्रतिष्ठेरन्नेवैतस्मादात्मनः सर्वे प्राणा यथायतनं विप्रतिष्ठन्ते प्राणेभ्यो देवा, देवेभ्यो लोकाः। From T.U. तस्माद्वा एतस्मादात्मन आकाशः सम्भूतः। (T.U. 2-1) from C.U. आत्मन एवेदं सर्वम् (C.U. 7-26-1) and from P.U. (एष प्राणो जायते। (P.U. 3-3).

(That the same Supreme Reality Brahman has been dealt with in the succeedding sūtras with the relevant passages from the C.U. VI. Rāmānuja also takes the sūtra to mean 'On account of

sameness of import.' He quotes from the Ait.U., Tait.U., and B.U. indicating तेषु सर्वेश्वरः कारणमवगम्यते।

Vallabha takes the word गति in the sense of liberation. In the state of liberation, the Lord is common for all. He quotes from the B.U. यथा सर्वासामपां समुद्र एकायनम्... न प्रेत्य संज्ञास्ति। (B.U. 2-4-12 to 4-5-13) and so on.

Now, this sūtra (गतिसामान्यात्) should mean Brahman is the common resort of all beings. This will be an additional argument in support of the statement 'Brahman is the cause of the world.' As Brahman is the cause of everything, everything should return to it. If this is the meaning of the sūtra, then, the śrutipassage is to be from the C.U. and possibly from C.U. VI. Moreover in the text श्रुतत्वाच्च, there will be an occasion to quote the passages from the different Upaniṣads. As we have seen the C.U. VI providing the v.v. of this adhikaraṇa, and now, in this sūtra also, we should find out the v.v. from the C.U. VI. That passage probably would be एवमेव खलु सोम्येमाः सर्वा प्रजाः सत आगम्य न विदुः सत आगच्छामह इति।

त इह व्याघ्रो वा सिंहो वा वृको वा वराहो वा कीटो वा पतङ्गो वा दंशो वा मशको वा यद्यद्भवन्ति तद्भवन्ति। (C.U. VI-10-2)

This should be the v.v. of the sūtra गतिसामान्यात्। We should trace this v.v. on the basis of our approach to the context. This is also one of the approaches which could help us in locating the exact v.v. of a sūtra.

CHAPTER - 4

THE VIṢAYAVĀKYAS IN THE FIRST AND SECOND PĀDA OF THE SAMANVAYĀDHYĀYA

The first adhyāya of the Brahmasūtra is traditionally designated as Samanvayādhyāya in which the reconciliation of all the divergent views about the ultimate reality i.e. Brahman expressed in the scriptural passages is attempted. According to Śaṅkara, the reconciliation is meant to be principally of the Vedāntavākyas i.e. of the Upaniṣadic passages.[1]

Madhva on the other hand understands by Samanvaya, to quote B.N.K. Sharma, 'an exegetical method by which a direct and complete' at-one-ment 'of the whole body of Śāstra is established with Brahman thro' (sic)numerous descriptions and marks of import (tātparyaliṅgas) embodied in it.[2]

Vallabha maintains that the first adhyāya deals with the passages relating to the nature of Brahman तत्र प्रथमेऽध्याये स्वरुपवाक्यानि विचार्यन्ते।[3]

In the commentary of Baladeva, it is stated that in the first book, the author shows 'that all the Vedic texts uniformly refer to Brahman, and find their samanvaya in him.'[4]

Śrīcidghanānandapurī who has prepared a sort of concordance of the bhāṣyas of the Brahmasūtra in ब्रह्मसूत्रभाष्यनिर्णय: writes तत्रापि प्रथमाध्याये ग्रन्थप्रतिपाद्यमतवादाश्रयभूतश्रुतीनां समन्वयं प्रदर्शयता तत्त्ववर्णनं कृतम्।[5]

---

1. एवं तावद्वेदान्तवाक्यानां ब्रह्मात्मावगतिप्रयोजनानां ब्रह्मात्मनि तात्पर्येण समन्वितानाम्।

   The Brahmasūtra Śāṅkara Bhāṣya with the commentaries Bhāmatī, Kalpataru, and Parimala, NSP.
2. Sharma B.N.K., The Brahmasūtras and Their Principal Commentaries, Vol. 1, p. ii.
3. Brahmasūtra 1-1-4, in the introduction to the fourth sūtra श्रीमद्ब्रह्मसूत्राणुभाष्यम् प्रदीपसहितम् ed. by Shastri Maganlal Sharma, pub. by Butala and Company, Second Reprint.
4. The Vedāntasūtras of Bādarāyaṇa with the Commentary of Baladeva, Tr. Rai Bahadur Srisachandra Vasu, Second Edition.
5. Śrīcidghanānandapuri - ब्रह्मसूत्रभाष्यनिर्णय: p.35

Thus all the abovegoing discussion would reinforce the view that mostly the Upaniṣadic passages form the topic of discussion. In other words, inversely, the Brahmasūtras have the Vedānta-vākyas as the Viṣayavākyas. Vallabha is perhaps more specific. According to Vallabha the passages dealing with the nature of Brahman are of two types viz. ambiguous and unambiguous. These which are unambiguous need not be discussed. Those which are ambigous are of four types viz, passages dealing with the effects, passages dealing with the inner controller, passages dealing with the form of the Lord to be worshipped and passages of various sundry subjects. [1]

Jijñāsā-Adhikaraṇam (1-1-1)

Now dealing with the sūtras proper, the first adhikaraṇa of the Brahmasūtra consists only of one sūtra i.e. अथातो ब्रह्मजिज्ञासा (1-1-1) Now, therefore, desire of inquiring into Brahman. The V.V. of the sūtra according to Śaṅkara shall be तद्विजिज्ञासस्व, तद्ब्रह्म (T.U. 3-1-1) seek to know that, that is Brahman.[2]

Bhāskara seems to refer to the B.U. passage आत्मा वा अरे द्रष्टव्य: श्रोतव्यो मन्तव्यो निदिध्यासितव्य:। (B.U. 2-4-5)

Verily it is the self that should be seen, heard of, reflected on and meditated upon.[3] In his commentary he specifies the V.V. by saying that श्रवणादिनोपायेन प्रयतमानस्यात्मदर्शनमुपपद्यत इति।[4] It is a natural corollary that a person trying by means of hearing etc. realises the self. In the commentary the word श्रवणादिनोपायेन clearly refers to the above quoted B.U. 2-4-5 passage.

Rāmānuja refers among other passages from the various Upaniṣads also to the B.U. passage. This is made clear by his

---

1. तत्र प्रथमेऽध्याये स्वरूपवाक्यानि विचार्यन्ते। तानि द्विविधानि। संदिग्धानि नि:संदिग्धानि च। तत्र नि:संदिग्धानां निर्णयो न वक्तव्य:। संदिग्धानि पुनश्चतुर्विधानि कार्यप्रतिपादकानि। अन्तर्यामिप्रतिपादकानि। उपास्यरूपप्रतिपादकानि। प्रकीर्णकानि चेति। (अणुभाष्य 1-1-4)
2. ब्रह्मसूत्रशाङ्करभाष्यम्। 1-1-1 p.77
3. ब्रह्मसूत्रभाष्यम् भास्करांचार्यविरचितम् - 1-1-1
4. Ibid.

specific remarks श्रोतव्यः इति चानुवादः श्रवणप्रतिष्ठार्थत्वान्मननस्य मन्तव्यः इति चानुवादः।[1] These remarks refer to the B.U. 2-4-5 passage.

Madhva also refers to the same B.U. passage.[2] According to aladeva, the v.v. of the sūtra would be

यो वै भूमा तत्सुखं नाल्पे सुखमस्ति। भूमैव सुखं भूमा त्वेव विजिज्ञासितव्य इति भूमानं भगवो विजिज्ञास इति। (CU. 7-23-3).[3] Whatever is infinite that is happiness, There is no happiness in the small. The infinite is happiness. So one must desire to understand the infinite. Of course, Baladeva also quotes the B.U. Passage.

Śrīnivāsācārya also refers to the B.U. passage as the V.V.[4] It may be noted that, most of the commentators take the B.U. passage as the V.V. of the sūtra. But Śaṅkara, does not refer to this passage. As noted earlier, he refers to the T.U. passage तद्विजिज्ञासस्व, तद् ब्रह्म। (T.U. 3-1) It would not be incorrect to say that, Śaṅkara seems to be giving more weightage to this passage as he significantly adds after this passage

तद्धि इति प्रत्यक्षमेव ब्रह्मणो जिज्ञासाकर्मत्वं दर्शयन्ति।[5] Of course verb in plural would suggest other passages also.

Cidghanānandapuri who generally follows Saṅkara in his Brahmasūtrabhāṣyanirṇaya also regards the B.U. passage as the V.V. [6]

Janmādyadhikaraṇam (1-1-2)

जन्माद्यधिकरण has also one sūtra. The sūtra is जन्माद्यस्य यतः। (1-1-2) (Brahman is that) from which origin etc. i.e. subsistence and dissolution of this (would proceed).

---

1. Śrībhāṣya of Rāmānuja, Part-I pp. 14-15 ed. by R.D. Karmarkar
2. पूर्णप्रज्ञदर्शनम्- श्रीमदानन्दतीर्थभगवत् —पूज्यपाद विरचित भाष्यसमेतम्
3. The Vedāntasūtras of Bādarāyaṇa with the Commentary of Baladeva, Tr. Rai Bhahadur Srisachandra Vasu.
4. Vedānta Pārijāta Saurabha of Nimbārka and Vedānta Kaustubha of Śrīnivāsa (commentaries on the Brahmasūtra)
5. ब्रह्मसूत्र शाङ्करभाष्यम्। 1-1-1 p.77
6. तत्र प्रथमाधिकरणे अथातो ब्रह्मजिज्ञासा इति प्रथमसूत्रे वेदान्तवाक्यविचारः विषयत्वेन गृहीतः। तेन आत्मा वा अरे द्रष्टव्यः श्रोतव्यो मन्तव्यो निदध्यासितव्यः इत्याद्याः श्रुतयः उपजीव्यत्वेन ग्रहणीया इति।

The V.V. of this sūtra is from the T.U. यतो वा इमानि भूतानि जायन्ते। येन जातानि जीवन्ति। यत्प्रयन्त्यभिसंविशन्ति। तद् विजिज्ञासस्व। तद्ब्रह्मेति। (T.U. 3-1) That verily, from which these beings are born, that by which, when born, they live, that into which, when departing they enter. That, seek to know. That is Brahman.

Śaṅkara seems to be taking the whole of the passage as the V.V. of the sūtra. At the beginning of his commentary on the sūtra, he refers to the above-quoted T.U. passage with the words श्रुतिनिर्देशस्तावत्। Then further during the course of his comments he pointedly introduces this passage with the reasoning. Let us quote the whole passage

तस्माज्जन्मादिसूत्रं नानुमानोपन्यासार्थम्। किं तर्हि? पुनस्तद्वेदान्तवाक्यप्रदर्शनार्थम्। किं पुनस्तद् वेदान्तवाक्यं यत्सूत्रेण लिलक्षयिषितम्। भृगुर्वै वारुणिः वरुणं पितरमुपससार। अधीहि भगवो ब्रह्मेति इत्युपक्रम्याह— यतो वा इमानि भूतानि जायन्ते। येन जातानि जीवन्ति। यत्प्रयन्त्यभिसंविशन्ति। तद् विजिज्ञासस्व। तद् ब्रह्मेति। तस्य च निर्णयवाक्यम् आनन्दात् ह्येव खल्विमानि भूतानि जायन्ते। आनन्देन जातानि जीवन्ति। आनन्दं प्रयन्त्यभिसंविशन्तीति (T.U. 3-6)

Then Śaṅkara concludes अन्यान्यप्येवं जातीयकानि वाक्यानि नित्यशुद्धबुद्धमुक्तस्वभावसर्वज्ञस्वरूपकारणविषयाण्युदाहर्तव्यानि।

Therefore the sūtra under discussion is not meant to propound inference (as the means of knowing Brahman) but rather to set forth a Vedānta-text. What then is the Vedānta-text which the sūtra points out at as having to be considered with reference to the characteristics of Brahman? It is the passage T.U. 3-1. Bhṛgu Vāruṇi went to his father Varuṇa saying 'Sir, teach me Brahman' and upto 'That from whence these beings are both, that by which when born, they live, that into which they enter at their death, try to know that. That is Brahman.' The sentence finally determining the sense of this passage is found 3-6 from bliss, these being are born, by bliss when born, they live, into bliss, they enter at their death'. Other passages are also to be introduced which declare the cause to be the almighty Being, whose essential is eternal purity, intelligence and freedom'[1]

---

1. Tr. by Thibaut George - The Vedānta sūtras with the Commentary by Śaṅkarācārya Part-I, p. 19

For Bhāskara, Rāmānuja, Madhva, Baladeva and Śrīnivāsa the V.V. is the very same of the T.U. quoted above.

En passant, it may be noted that Vallabha is the only commentator who differs from the rest of the commentators in taking this sūtra and the following together as one and also interpreting them differently. To wit, Vallabha unlike other commentators takes the compound जन्मादि as अतद्गुणसंविज्ञानबहुव्रीहि: ।

Moreover Vallabha takes the word जन्मादि to mean six भावविकारा: viz. origination, existence, modification, augmentation, decrease and destruction.[1]

Madhva, similarly, by the word जन्मादि understands, along with जन्म, जन्मादि and लय also नियमन (control) ज्ञान (knowledge) अज्ञान (ignorance) बन्ध (bondage) and मोक्ष (release)[2]

Śāstrayonitvādhikaraṇa (1-1-3)

This is also a one-sūtra-adhikaraṇa. The sūtra is शास्त्रयोनित्वात्। (1-1-3) From its being the source of scripture. Or the sūtra may also mean Scripture being the source (of its knowledge). Śaṅkara gives two interpretations to the sūtra (i) शास्त्रस्य योनि: ।

Tatpuruṣa compound. Brahman is the cause of source of scripture

(ii) शास्त्रं योनि: कारणं ब्रह्मणो यथावत्स्वरूपाधिगमे। Bahuvrīhi compound.[3] Scripture is the means of right knowledge through which we understand the nature of Brahman.

Relevant passage of the Sūtra, according to the first interpretation is अस्य महतो भूतस्य नि:श्वसितमेतद्यदृग्वेद: । (B.U. 2-4-10) The Ṛgveda etc. have been breathed forth from that great being. The scriptures have come forth out of it i.e. Brahman. Brahman is the source of the scriptures.

Or from the scripture we can know about the nature of Brahman as innumerable scriptures such as यतो वा इमानि भूतानि जायन्ते। (T.U.) reveal the nature of Brahman.

Almost all the commentators take the word योनि: in the sense of प्रमाणम्। Śaṅkara as noted above in addition to this, takes it in the sense of source also.

---

1. श्रीमद्ब्रह्मसूत्राणुभाष्यम् p.18
2. पूर्णप्रज्ञदर्शनम् p.6
3. ब्रह्मसूत्रशाङ्करभाष्यम् p.96 & p.100

Madhva explains the term Śāstra as the Vedas, Upaniṣads, Purāṇas, Epics, Mūlarāmayaṇa, Pañcarātras and whatever else is in conformity with their teachings.[1]

Baladeva explains the sūtra thus 'The existence of Brahman cannot be inferred' because he is to be known only through scriptures', Baladeva, here in this sūtra, goes out of the set groove of the classical Upaniṣads and quotes the relevant passages from the Gopālapūrvatāpini Upaniṣad and B.U. respectively.

सच्चिदानन्दरूपाय कृष्णायाक्लिष्टकारिणे।
नमो वेदान्तवेद्याय गुरवे बुद्धिसाक्षिणे।।[2]

Salutation to Kṛṣṇa who is true being, All-Intelligence, and Eternal Bliss who is the saviour of everything, who is known by the Vedānta alone, who is supreme Teacher and who is the witness of Buddhi. and in B.U.

तं त्वौपनिषदं पुरुषं पृच्छामि। (B.U. 3-9-26)

I now, ask you about that person who is taught in the Upaniṣads.

It is also quite plausible to consider the passage from the Kaṭha Up. सर्वे वेदा यत्पदमामनन्ति (2-15 Kaṭha U.) as the V.V. of this Sūtra.[3]

Samanvayādhikaraṇam (1-1-4)

This is also a one-Sūtra adhikaraṇa and the Sūtra, last of the Catuḥsūtrī तत्तु समन्वयात् (1-1-4) need not detain us any longer as far as the V.V. is concerned. The sūtra aims at harmonising of the different scriptural statements. Śaṅkara profusely quotes from the Upaniṣads in order to establish that all Vedāntic passages are connected with Brahman. He paraphrases the sūtra thus तु शब्दः पूर्वपक्षव्यावृत्त्यर्थः। तत् ब्रह्म सर्वज्ञं सर्वशक्तिजगदुत्पत्तिस्थितिलयकारकं वेदान्तशास्त्रादेवावगम्यते। कथम्। समन्वयात्। सर्वेषु हि वेदान्तेषु वाक्यानि तात्पर्येणैतस्यार्थस्य प्रतिपादकत्वेन समनुगतानि। सदेव सोम्य इदमग्र आसीत्। एकमेवाद्वितीयम्। (C.U. 6-2-1) आत्मा वा इदमेक एवाग्र आसीत्। (Ait.A. 2-4-1-1) तदेतद्ब्रह्मापूर्वमनपरमनन्तरबाह्यम्।अयमात्मा ब्रह्म सर्वानुभूः। (B.U. 2-5-19)

---

1. पूर्णप्रज्ञदर्शनम् p.7
2. गोपालतापिन्युपनिषत्, p.41
3. The Vedāntasūtras of Bādarāyaṇa with the Commentary of Baladeva, Tr, by Rai Bahadur Srisachandra Vasu, P.17.

ब्रह्मैवेदममृतं पुरस्तात् (M.U. 2-2-11)[1] The word 'but' is meant to refute the prima facie view. That all-knowing, all powerful Brahman, which is cause of the origin, subsistence and dissolution of the world, is known from the Vedānta part of scripture. How? Because in all the Vedānta texts, the sentences agree in so far as they have for their purport, as they intimate that matter (i.e. Brahman). Compare for instance Being only this was in the beginning one without a second' (C.U. 6-2-1). In the beginning all this was self, one only (Ait.Ā. 2-4-1-1). This is the Brahman, without cause, and without effect, without anything inside or outside, this self is Brahman perceiving everything (B.U. 2-5-19) That immortal Brahman is before (M.U. 2-2-11). Śaṅkara discusses many issues in the course of his commentary on this sūtra. He cites appropriate passages from the Upaniṣadic literature relevant to the issue and he states the conclusion of this sūtra in the beginning of the next adhikaraṇa.

So far it has been declared that the Vedānta passages, whose purport is the comprehension of Brahman being the self and which have their object therein, refer exclusively to Brahman without any reference to actions.[2]

As for the v.v. as Cidghanānanda Puri puts it सर्वे वेदान्ताः विषयत्वेन गृहीताः ।[3] which is very obvious and natural.

However, Vallabha is alone in interpreting the sūtra as Brahman is the material cause of the world as is invariably immanent in the world. Vallabha takes समन्वय to mean समवाय.

Vallabha quotes स आत्मानं स्वयमकुरुत। (T.U. 2-7)[4] which would be a V.V. according to him. Vallabha rejects the interpretation of Śaṅkara and others by stating that समन्वय as interpreted by them is the object of the following sūtras.

किं च वेदान्तवाक्यानामस्मिन्शास्त्रे समन्वय एव प्रतिपाद्यते संदेहनिराकरण द्वारा। तत्कथं सिद्धवृद्धेतुत्वेन निर्देशः। अग्रिमवैयर्थ्यं च स्यात्।[5]

1. ब्रह्मसूत्रशाङ्करभाष्यम् p. 102
2. Ibid p. 161
3. ब्रह्मसूत्रभाष्यनिर्णयः। Part II p.14
4. श्रीमद्ब्रह्मसूत्राणुभाष्यम् p. 23-24
5. Ibid PP 26-27

According to Ghate, the same charge can be brought against Vallabha himself, for sūtra 1-4-23 प्रकृतिश्च प्रतिज्ञादृष्टान्तानुपरोधात्। also makes out the same point i.e. that Brahman is also material cause of the universe.[1]

Thus here ends Catuḥsūtrī or Trisūtrī according to Vallabha which is believed to be containing the essence of the entire Brahmasūtra.

Īkṣatyadhikaraṇam (1-1-5 to 11)

This adhikaraṇa has the following sūtras viz.

(i) ईक्षतेर्नाशब्दम् (1-1-5)

(ii) गौणश्चेन्नात्मशब्दात् (1-1-6)

(iii) तन्निष्ठस्य मोक्षोपदेशात् (1-1-7)

(iv) हेयत्वावचनाच्च। (1-1-8)

(v) स्वाप्ययात्। (1-1-9)

(vi) गतिसामान्यात्। (1-1-10)

(vii) श्रुतत्वाच्च। (1-1-11)

Now, as we know, there is not unanimity among the commentators about the alignment of the sūtras into adhikaraṇas. This division of sūtras into adhikaraṇas is also an important factor in determining the V.V. of an adhikaraṇa and thereby of individual sūtras. In arrangement or rearrangement of the sūtras into an adhikaraṇa, we must take into account the general drift of the meaning of the sūtras. But while doing so, we cannot set aside the tradition about a particular adhikaraṇa that is reflected in the bhāṣyas. If the tradition is unanimous regarding an adhikaraṇa comprising certain sūtras, then we have to go by it while interpreting the sūtras. And here, as far as this Īkṣatyadhikaraṇa is concerned, there is no difference of opinion among the commentators about the adhikaraṇa and the sūtras comprising it.

It can safely be said that the first sūtra of an adhikaraṇa states the proposition which is substantiated in the course of the discussion in the adhikaraṇa. So here, the first sūtra, initiates the discussion by 'making a statement' on account of seeing (the matter) which is not the topic of the scripture is not (the cause).

---

1. Ghate V.S., The Vedānta p. 54

The key word in the sūtra is ईक्षते : The word is in the ablative as it states the reason we should endeavour to find out those passages of the Upaniṣads which contain the verb, ईक्ष् or its formations. Of course, Śaṅkara has the following observation to make about the sūtra.

ईक्षतेरिति च धात्वर्थ निर्देशोऽभिप्रेत: यजतेरितिवत्। न धातुनिर्देश:। तेन य: सर्वज्ञ: सर्वविद्यस्य ज्ञानमयं तप:। तस्मादेतद्ब्रह्मनाम रूपमन्नं च जायते। (M.U. 1-1-9) इत्येवमादीन्यपि सर्वज्ञेश्वरकारणपराणि वाक्यान्युदाहर्तव्यानि।[1]

By seeing is not meant that particular verb only, but any verbs which have a cognate sense; just as the verb यज् yaj is used to signify any verb denoting 'to sacrifice, to offer', therefore other passages also whose purport is to intimate that an all-knowing Lord is the cause of the world, are to be quoted here, as for example, 'From Him, who perceives all, and who knows all, whose brooding consists of knowledge from him is born that Brahman, name and form and food.'[2] In a way, this is quite a sound and sensible principle enunciated by the great ācārya but it needs some qualification added to it. If there is no relevant passage containing the verb ईक्ष् or its formations, then only one should go in search of its synonyms. But here, there are many passages containing the verb, ईक्ष् and its formations in the Upaniṣads. So for once at least, we can try to apply this modified principle of Śaṅkarācārya to the search of a V.V. So let us see whether, this principle is applicable here or not.

Col. Jacob has laid us under obligation by preparing a concordance of the Upaniṣadic passages and made our task less strenuous. The concordance gives the following passages having the verb ईक्ष्

Ait. U. 1-1 स ईक्षत लोकान्नु सृजे।

3 स ईक्षतेमे नु लोका:।

3-11 स ईक्षति कथं न्विदं महते स्यात्।

– स इक्षत कतरेण प्रपद्ये।

–स ईक्षत यदि वाचाभिव्याहृतं... अथ कोऽहमिति।

---

1. ब्रह्मसूत्रशाङ्करभाष्यम् p. 169

2. Tr. by Thibauṭ George - The Vedānta Sūtras with the commentary by Śaṁkarācārya part I p. 48

Ken. U. त ऐक्षन्तास्माकमेवायं विजयः।

Chā. U. 6-2-3 तदैक्षत बहु स्यां प्रजायेय।

तेज ऐक्षत बहु स्याम।

6-2-4 आप ऐक्षन्त बहव्य: स्याम।

6-3-2 सेयं देवतैक्षत।

Br. 1-2-5 स ऐक्षत यदि वा इममभिमंस्ये।

1-4-2 स हायमीक्षाञ्चक्रे।

1-4-4 सो हेयमीक्षाञ्चक्रे।

6-4-2 प्रजापतिरीक्षाञ्चक्रे हन्तास्मै प्रतिष्ठां कल्पयामि।

Kaṭha 4-1 कश्चिद्धीरः प्रत्यगात्मानमैक्षत।

Maitri 7-1 विवरणेक्षन्ति।

Prașna 5-5 पुरिशयं पुरुषमीक्षते।

Gauḍa 4-66 जाग्रच्चित्तेक्षणीयास्ते।

Nṛsut. 6 त एक्षन्त हन्तैनमासुरं पाप्मानं परिग्रसामः।

Rāmp. 36 तद्वयाजेनेमितुं सीताम्।[1]

Now out of these several passages containing the formulations, which was the one intended by the sūtrakāra? Passages from Kena, Kaṭha, Maitri, Gauḍa, and Nṛsut bow out of competition as none of them has a sustained discussion so as to form an adhikaraṇa. The passage from the P.U. also belongs to the same category. The passage deals with the liberation process. It runs thus एवं ह वै स पाप्मना विनिर्मुक्तः स सामभिरुन्नीयते ब्रह्मलोकम्। स हतस्माज्जीवघनात् परात्परं पुरिशयं पुरुषमीक्षते। (P.U. 5-5) Even so he is freed from sins. He is led by Sāman to the world of Brahma. He sees the person that dwells in the body, who is higher than the highest life.

The Ait. U., the C.U. and the B.U. remain in the field. Taking into consideration the sūtras of the adhikaraṇa also, it is certain that the sūtras apart from the first one which initiates the discussion do not deal with the elaborate creation process as such which happens to be the topic of the discussion, in the B.U. passage. The Aitareya passage does deal with the perceiving one but does not make any allusion either to liberation referred to in the sūtra 1-1-7 तन्निष्ठस्य or to sleep or dissolution mentioned in the

---

1. Colonel Jacob, A concordance to the Principal Upaniṣads and Bhagavadgītā, Reprint 1963, pp-215-216

1-1-9 स्वाप्ययात्। So now remains the C.U. 6 passage which forms the topic of the discussion in this adhikaraṇa. We can say with certainty that the C.U. 6 is the proper v.v. of the adhikaraṇa. Now let us take the sūtras one by one and see which portion of this passage forms the V.V. of the sūtra. The context of the C.U. 6 passage is as follows.

Father of Śvetaketu is telling him about that instruction

येनाश्रुतं श्रुतं भवत्यमतं मतमविज्ञातं विज्ञातमिति। By which the unhearable becomes heard, the unperceivable becomes perceived, the unknowable becomes known. This, obviously refers to Brahman, the supreme reality. Then the father further instructs his son that in the beginning there was Being alone.

सदेव सोम्येदमग्र आसीदेकमेवाद्वितीयम्।

Then comes that famous line to which our adhikaraṇa refers

तदैक्षत। बहु स्यां प्रजायेयेति। It thought, May I be many, so it sent forth fire. Fire sent forth water. Water sent forth food, and so on. So this prapāṭhaka is the subject of discussion of this adhikaraṇa and it will be our endeavour to locate the V.V.s of the individual sūtras, according to their context from this portion of the C.U.

The first sūtra is ईक्षतेर्नाशब्दम् (1-1-5). Because of 'seeing' which is not mentioned in the scripture is not the (cause). The sūtra has तदैक्षत बहुस्यां प्रजायेयेति। (C.U. 6-2-3) It thought, may I be many, as the v.v.

The second sūtra is गौणश्चेन्नात्मशब्दात् (1-1-6). On account of the word self (used for the cause), (the meaning of the word 'seeing') is not figurative. स च एषोऽणिमैतदात्म्यमिदं सर्वम्। तत्सत्यम्। स आत्मा तत्त्वमसि श्वेतकेतो इति। (C.U. 6-8-7)

That which is the subtle essence (the root of all) this whole world has for its self. That is the truth. That is the self. That art thou, Śvetaketu. The sūtra refers to this part of the Upaniṣad.

The third sūtra is तन्निष्ठस्य मोक्षोपदेशात्। Because release is taught of him who is devoted to that (Brahman). Śvetaketu repeatedly requests his father to teach him further about तत्त्वमसि. And the father ultimately preaches him about the release, with the help of a picturesque analogy.

यथा सोम्य पुरुषं गन्धारेभ्योऽभिनद्धाक्षमानीय तं ततोऽतिजने विसृजेत्स यथा तत्र प्राङ्वोदङ् वाधराङ्वा प्रत्यङ्वा प्रध्मायीताभिनद्धाक्ष आनीतोऽभिनद्धाक्षो विसृष्टः। तस्य

यथाभिनहनं प्रमुच्य प्रब्रूयादेतां दिशं गन्धारा एतां दिश व्रजेति। स ग्रामाद्ग्रामं पृच्छन् पण्डितो मेधावी गन्धारानेवोपसंपद्येत। एवमेवेहाऽऽचार्यवान्पुरुषो वेद। तस्य तावदेव चिरं यावन्न विमोक्ष्येऽथ संपत्स्य इति। (C.U. 6-14-1, 2)

Just as, my dear, one might lead a person away from the Gāndharas with his eyes bandaged and abandon him in a place where there are no human beings, and just as that person would shout towards the east, or the north, or the south or the west. I have been led here with my eyes bandaged. And as, one released his bandage and told him, 'In that direction Gāndharas, go to this direction', thereupon, being informed and capable of judgement he would by asking (his way) from village to village arrive at Gāndhāra, in exactly the same manner does one here who has a teacher knows I shall remain here only so long as I shall not be released. Then I shall reach perfection.

Obviously the sūtra refers to the last line which can be regarded as the V.V. of the sūtra.

The fourth sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is हेयत्वावचनाच्च। (1-1-8) And because there is no statement that it has to be discarded.

This sūtra does not refer to any passage because no passage states that sat or Brahman should be abjured or discarded.

This is an argument et silentio. Had Matter (Prakṛti) been the subject of this passage, there would have been a statement that it should be shunned as it could not be the very self of the sentient soul. But as there is no such statement.

Matter is not meant to be put forth here. It is Brahman, the Ultimate sentient principle that is the purport of the passage. Thus no particular Upaniṣadic section could be mentioned as the V.V. of this sūtra.

The fifth sūtra is स्वाप्ययात् (1-1-9). On account (of the individual soul) entering the self. The sūtra has

यत्रैतत्पुरुषः स्वपिति नाम सता सोम्य तदा संपन्नो भवति स्वमपीतो भवति तस्मादेनं स्वपितीत्याचक्षते स्वं ह्यपीतो भवति। (C.U. 6-8-1)

When a person here sleeps, as it is called, then my dear, he has reached pure being, He has gone to his own. Therefore they say, he sleeps for he has gone to his own, as the V.V. In fact, this is the sūtra which helps us to single out the C.U. 6 passage from the other contending passages.

The sixth sūtra is गतिसामान्यात्। on account of the common resort (to Brahman by all beings).

According to Śaṅkara, the sūtra would mean 'on account of the uniformity of teaching (Brahman is to be treated as the cause)' In the light of this meaning, passages indicating Brahman being the cause from various Upaniṣads are cited in his Bhāṣya. But, this seems to be unwarranted on the ground of the context of the adhikaraṇa and the individual sūtras and the C.U. passage. The first sūtra of the adhikaraṇa established Brahman as the cause of the world and not the pradhāna, on account of pradhāna's non-mention in the scriptures. That the same Supreme Reality Brahman has been dealt with in the succeeding sūtras with portions of the same C.U. 6 passage as the V.V., is certain.

So now गतिसामान्यात् also has to be interpreted in the same context, with the help of the same passage from the C.U. The sūtra provides a further reason to Brahman's being the cause as It is the common resort of all the beings. So the v.v. of this sūtra should be from the same portion of the C.U. The passage would be एवमेव खलु सोम्येमा: सर्वा: प्रजा: सति संपद्य न विदु: सति संपद्यामह इति। त इह व्याघ्रो वा सिंहो वा वृको वा वराहो वा कीटो वा पतङ्गो वा दंशो वा मशको वा यद्यद्भवन्ति तदाभवन्ति। (C.U. 6-9-2) In the same manner, my dear, all these creatures even though, they have reached being, do not know that they have reached the Being. Whatever they are in this world, tiger, or lion, or wolf, or boar or worm, or fly or gnat or mosquito that they become.

This should be the precise V.V. of this sūtra. When the passage yields an excellent V.V., why should one have to go outside the C.U. to locate a v.v. for this sūtra, Moreover, in the very next sūtra, we will have to cite the passages from the various Upaniṣads. The principle of context demands that we should stick to the portion of the C.U. 6 for the V.V.s as far as possible.

The next and the last sūtra is श्रुतत्वाच्च (1-1-11) on account of the scriptural passages. Scriptural passages also affirm that Brahman is the cause of the world. Here, we think that, it would be proper to cite those passages referred to in the previous sūtra, as the V.V.s. (Kau.U. 3-3) As from a burning fire sparks proceed in all directions thus from that self the prāṇas proceed each towards its place, from the prāṇas the gods, from the gods the

worlds. तस्माद्वा एतस्मादात्मन आकाशः संभूतः। (T.U. 2-1). From that self sprang ether. आत्मन एवेदं सर्वम्। (C.U. 7-26-1) All this springs from the self. And also passage cited in this sūtra by Śaṅkara, स कारणं करणाधिपाधिपो न चास्य कश्चिज्जनिता च चाधिपः। (S.U. 6-9) He is the cause, the Lord of the Lords of the organs, and there is of Him neither parent nor Lord.

The interpretation offered by Madhva may briefly be stated here, as it differs from all other commentators. According to Madhva, the sūtra ईक्षतेर्नाशब्दम् (1-1-5) would mean, (Brahman) is not inexpressible as it is an object of knowledge. The V.V. of the sūtra is स एतस्माज्जीवघनात् परात्परं पुरिशयमीक्षते। (P.U. 5-5) and he follows this line of argument in the subsequent sūtras.[1] In the Brahmasūtra शब्द would always mean the 'scripture' and not the expressibility. So this is the main difficulty in accepting the interpretation of the adhikaraṇa offered by Madhva. Of course, S.N. Dasgupta opines that the interpretation is surely not less cogent.[2]

Ānandamayādhikaraṇam (1-1-12 to 19).

The adhikaraṇa comprises the following sūtras viz.

(i) आनन्दमयोऽभ्यासात् (1-1-12)

(ii) विकारशब्दान्नेति चेन्न प्राचुर्यात्। (1-1-13)

(iii) तद्धेतुव्यपदेशाच्च। (1-1-14)

(iv) मान्त्रवर्णिकमेव च गीयते। (1-1-15)

(v) नेतरोऽनुपपत्तेः। (1-1-16)

(vi) भेदव्यपदेशाच्च। (1-1-17)

(viii) अस्मिन्नस्य च तद्योगं शास्ति। (1-1-19)

This adhikaraṇa may be scrutinised from a different angle.

Looking at the wording of the sūtras and their meaning it appearently seems to be a primafacie case for rearrangement of the sūtras into adhikaraṇas. The first sūtra आनन्दमयोऽभ्यासात् (1-1-12) lays down the proposition that 'The one full of bliss is Brahman on account of repetition.' In the second sūtra विकारशब्दान्नेति चेन्न प्राचुर्यात् (1-1-13), the meaning of '*mayaṭ*' has been explained. The *mayaṭ* does not indicate any modification (विकार).

---

1. पूर्णप्रज्ञदर्शनम् p.8
2. History of Indian Philosophy Vol. IV p.130 fn.1

If it were to indicate any modification (विकार), then Brahman being beyond modification, would not have been meant here. The *mayaṭ* indicates abundance (प्राचुर्य). The third sūtra तद्धेतुव्यपदेशाच्च। 1-1-14) states that 'And because Brahman is declared to be the cause of the bliss.' Here it appears that one thought or a strand of the thought that 'Brahman is full of bliss' should be over. Moreover, the च in the sūtra तद्धेतुव्यपदेशाच्च would appear to be summing up the thought. So the Ānandamayādhikaraṇa should be of three sūtras only.

Then from the sūtra मान्त्रवर्णिकमेव च गीयते (1-1-15) a fresh thought seems to have been taken up. The subject of this adhikaraṇa is Brahman who is described in the mantra. So this sūtra i.e. 1-1-15 beings a fresh, with Brahman as the subject. Then in the next sūtra नेतरोऽनुपपत्तेः। (1-1-16) 'There can not be any other than Brahman because it would not be appropriate.' The sūtra means that jīva cannot be meant here. Further, in the next sūtra, भेदव्यपदेशाच्च।

The difference between Brahman and the self is said to be taught in the Upaniṣads. Here another strand of thought i.e. Brahman, and not jīva is the subject of discussion in the scriptures is over. So the sūtras 15, 16 and 17 should form a separate adhikaraṇa,

Then again a fresh thought may appear to be taken up in the next two sūtras viz. 1-1-18 and 1-1-19. The first sūtra is कामाच्च नानुमानापेक्षा। (1-1-18) And on account of desire there is no need of an inference. Brahman and not pradhāna is capable of desiring. In the next sūtra अस्मिन्नस्य च तद्योगं शास्ति। (1-1-19) it is stated that the scriptures teach the union of this self with that Brahman.

So out of the original Ānandamayādhikaraṇa, three separate adhikaraṇas could be carved out. But, to put the record straight, there is no tradition to support this line of division of the sūtras. All the commentators are unanimous about the existing arrangement of the sūtras into an ānandamayādhikaraṇa. Moreover, the च in मान्त्रवर्णिकमेव च गीयते and in कामाच्च नानुमानापेक्षा suggest that the argument in the earlier sūtras is continued and that a new topic of discussion is not initiated. Nevertheless, the three different units of the adhikaraṇa as pointed out above constitute three independent approaches to the same conclusion.

But if we take into account the sūtras, as they stand, then also, it is worth noting that the V.V.s of the adhikaraṇa and all the individual sūtras are from the T.U. We may briefly discuss the sūtras from this point of view. The first sūtra is आनन्दमयोऽभ्यासात् (1-1-12). The one full of bliss is Brahman, on account of repetition. The word 'abhyāsāt' being in ablative gives the reason for the statement made that ānandamaya signifies Brahman. Though ānanda is one of the most frequently occurring words in the Upaniṣadic passages, the issue is clinched by an addition of suffix मय. The word आनन्दमय occurs in the T.U. तस्माद्वा एतस्माद्विज्ञानमयात्। अन्योऽन्तर आत्माऽऽनन्दमयः (T.U 2-5-1)

As compared with this cognitive body there is another internal self constituted 'by bliss'.[1] So this passage is the topic of discussion in this adhikaraṇa. The next sūtra विकारशब्दान्नेति चेन्न प्राचुर्यात्। (1-1-13). 'if it be said (that ānandamaya) does not (denote the highest self) since it is a word denoting modification, it is not so an account of abundance' discusses the appropriateness of the suffix mayaṭ even when ānandamaya signifies Brahman and hence the same passage of the sūtra 12 forms the V.V. of the sūtra 13. The next sūtra (1-1-14), And because (Brahman) is declared to be the cause of it (the bliss) refers to the passage तद्धेतुव्यपदेशाच्च एष ह्येवानन्दयाति (T.U. 2-7). For he alone causes bliss. It could also refer to रसो वै सः। रसं ह्येवायं लब्ध्वाऽऽनन्दी भवति। (T.U. 2-7). That verily is the essence of existence. For truly, on getting the essence, one becomes blissful.

The next sūtra मान्त्रवर्णिकमेव च गीयते। (1-1-15), The one (Brahman) described in the mantra is sung in the text that follows. The mantra referred to here is सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म यो वेद निहितं गुहायां परमे व्योमन्। सोऽश्नुते सर्वान् कामान् सह ब्रह्मणा विपश्चिता। Brahman is truth, knowledge and infinite.

He who knows that Brahman as existing in the intellect, lodged in the supreme space in the heart, enjoys as identified with the all-knowing Brahman, all desirable things simultaneously.[2] The subject of this mantra could be the very one that is treated in

---

1. Eight Upaniṣads Vol.1 with the Commentary of Śaṅkarācārya. Translated by Swami Gambhirananda, pub. by Advait Ashram, Calcutta, Second Ed. 1965, p. 333
2. Ibid p.299

the explanatory passage that follows viz. आत्मन: आकाश: संभूत:... etc. Thus it is clear that it is Brahman that is meant by the term 'Ānandamaya'.

The next sūtra is नेतरोऽनुपपत्ते: (1-1-16). (Ānandamaya is) not the other, because of inappropriateness. Ānandamaya is not jīva but Brahman only. T.U. states सोऽकामयत। बहुस्यां प्रजायेयेति। स तपोऽतप्यत। स तपस्तप्त्वा। इदं सर्वमसृजत। यदिदं किं च। (T.U. 2-6) He wished may I be many, may I grow forth. He performed austerity. Having performed austerity, he created all this, whatever is here. This cannot refer to jīva as it is inappropriate. The jīva is not the creator of all.

The next sūtra is भेदव्यपदेशाच्च (1-1 -17). And on account of the declaration of difference (between the two : Brahman and Jīva). The sūtra should refer to a passage which indicates the difference between Brahman and Jīva.

रसं ह्येवायं लब्ध्वाऽऽनन्दीभवति। (T.U. 2-6). For, truly, on getting the essence, one becomes blissful.

एतमानन्दमयमात्मानमुप संक्रामति। (T.U. 2-8). He reaches the self which consists of bliss. This passage pointedly brings out the difference between Brahman and Jīva. So this latter passage should be considered as the V.V. proper of the sūtra.

The next sūtra is कामाच्च नानुमानापेक्षा (1-1-18). And on account of desire, anumāna is not required. Anumāna is an inference, and what can be inferred is आनुमानिक i.e. of the सांख्य philosophy. And Brahman is expressly said to have desired, there is no necessity of going for inference.

The passage is सोऽकामयत। बहु स्यां प्रजायेय (C.U. 2-6). He wished may I be many, may I grow forth. When there is a clear statement denoting Brahman as the cause and as desiring, it is not necessary to attempt to arrive at a conclusion on the strength of inference or second-hand means of proof that the jīvas could be meant.

The last sūtra is अस्मिन्नस्य च तद्योगं शास्ति। (1-1-19). Moreover, the (scripture) teaches the union of jīva with Brahman, the two being mentioned separately. That with which the soul is united is the one signified by Ānandamaya. The sūtrakāra is bringing to a close the argument begun from the 16th sūtra. The V.V. would be that passage which teaches about the union of jīva with Brahman.

यदा ह्येवैष एतस्मिन्नदृश्येऽनात्म्येऽनिरुक्तेऽनिलयनेऽभयं प्रतिष्ठां विन्दते।

अथ सोऽभयं गतो भवति। यदा ह्येवैष एतस्मिन्नुदरमन्तरं कुरते।
अथ तस्य भयं भवति। (T.U. 2-7). For

Truly when one finds fearlessness as support undefined, without support, then has he reached fearlessness. When, however, this makes in this one, the smallest, interval, then for him there is fear.

Antarādhikaraṇam (1-1-20 to 21)

This adhikaraṇa has the following sūtras :

(i) अन्तस्तद्धर्मोपदेशात्। (1-1-20)

(ii) भेदव्यपदेशाच्चान्य: (l-l-2l)

This adhikaraṇa is important inasmuch as it provides an opportunity to make some observation regarding the V.V.

First of all, it is rather difficult to point out the exact passage taken up for discussion in this adhikaraṇa. The difficulty is, first of all, on account of the adhikaraṇa consisting of just two sūtras which do not yield sufficient opportunity to determine the general drift of the discussion which an adhikaraṇa with more sūtras would provide.

Secondly the general undistinguished common wording of the sūtras ako makes it difficult to glean the V.V. of the adhikaraṇa. It is obvious that the important word in the sūtra is अन्त:. Now this word with all its variations occurs in many Upaniṣadic passages, as can be seen from the Concordance of the Col. Jacob.[1] So this is of no help. So, there seems to be a stalemate.

But, a little guesswork may be resorted to. It may not be wide off the mark to assert that the sūtrakāra having disposed of the discussion regarding the passages dealing with the Blissful One, in the preceeding Ānanda-mayādhikaraṇa, takes up the discussion about the 'Insider', being most probably, influenced by the proximity and frequent occurrence of the word अन्तर in the T.U. passages forming the V.V.s of the previous adhikaraṇa. अन्योऽन्तर आत्मा प्राणमय: अन्योऽन्तर आत्मा मनोमय:, अन्योऽन्तर आत्मा विज्ञानमय:, and अन्योऽन्तर आत्माऽनन्दमय: So we surmise that the sūtrakāra embarks upon the problem of determining the one who is the 'Insider'.

1. Colonel Jacob, A Concordance to the Principal Upaniṣads and Bhagvadgītā pp. 60-61

Now if we consider that the passages from the C.U. are the v.v.s of the subsequent adhikaraṇas i.e. Ākāśādhikaraṇam, Prāṇādhikaraṇam, and Jyotiradhikaraṇam, here also, it is quite plausible to assume that the sūtrakāra takes up a passage from the C.U. for discussion.

Several other passages from the other Upaniṣads seem to be in a position to claim to be the V.V. of these sūtras. For example the passage योऽन्तरो यमयति of the M.U. (2-2-6).

But their claims have to be set aside against the background that now the sūtrakāra takes up the passages of the C.U. in continuation for consideration. This view also can be further supported by one of the theories regarding the text of the Brahmasūtra enunciated by one of our erudite scholars S.K. Belvalkar. S.K. Belvalkar observes '... there were Brahmasūtras earlier than the extant Brahmasūtra which is commonly attributed to the authorship of Bādarāyaṇa... That the majority of the texts that are discussed in the present Brahmasūtras hail from the C.U. has already been set forth by Deussen, so that there is nothing, improbable in the Chāndogya Brahmasūtra, having, in fact, formed the original nucleus of the present sūtras and been even incorporated therein.[1] So keeping in view this not implausible theory, the other factors being equal, the passages from the C.U. should be given precedence over other passages from the Upaniṣads other than the C.U.'

In the light of this, it becomes easy to decide upon the V.V.s of this adhikaraṇa and its sūtras.

The first sūtra is अन्तस्तद्धर्मोपदेशात्। (1-1-20). The Insider (is Brahman) because its qualities are mentioned.

The sūtra has अथ य एषोऽन्तरादित्ये हिरण्मयः पुरुषो दृश्यते हिरण्यश्मश्रुर्हिरण्यकेश आप्रणखात्सर्व एव सुवर्णः। तस्य यथा कप्यासं पुण्डरीकमेवमक्षिणी तस्योदिति नाम स एष सर्वेभ्यः पाप्मभ्य उदित उदेति ह वै सर्वेभ्यः पाप्मभ्यो य एवं वेद। (C.U. 1-6-6-7)

Now that golden person who is seen within the sun has a golden beard and golden hair. All is golden to the tips of the nails. His eyes are even as a red lotus flower. His name is high

1. Shree Gopal Basu Mallick Lectures on Vedānta Philosophy pp. 140-141

(ut). He has risen above all evil. Verily, he knows this rises above all evil as the V.V.

Once we accept this passage as the V.V. of the sūtra, the rest is self explanatory, inasmuch as qualities of Brahman are attributed to the Insider referred to in the passage.

The next sūtra is भेदव्यपदेशाच्चान्यः (1-1-21) On account of the declaration of difference, it is different from the jīva.

This sūtra makes an allusion to a passage which points out the difference between Brahman and jīva. This following passage suits the context.

अथ य एषोऽन्तरक्षिणि पुरुषो दृश्यते सैवार्क्। तत्साम। तदुक्थम्। तद्यजुः। तद्ब्रह्म। तस्यैतस्य तदेव रूपं यदमुष्य रूपम्। यावमुष्य गैष्णौ तौ गेष्णौ। यन्नाम तन्नाम। स एष ये चैतदस्मादर्वाञ्चो लोकास्तेषां चेष्टे मनुष्यकामानां चेति। अथ य एतदेवं विद्वान्साम गायत्युभौ स गायति। सोऽमुनैव स एष ये चामुष्मात्पराञ्चो लोकास्तांश्चाऽऽप्नोति देवकामांश्च। (C.U. 1-7-5,6,7). Now this person who is seen within the eye is the hymn, the chant is the recitation, is the sacrificial formula, is the prayer. The form of this one is the same as the form of that. The songs of the former are the songs of this. The name of the one is the name of the other. He is the Lord of the worlds which are under this one and also of men's desires. So those who sing on the vīṇā sing of him. Therefore they are winners of wealth. How, he knowing this, sings the Sāman, sings of both. Through the former (person in the sun) he obtains the worlds which are beyond that (the sun) as also the desires of the gods.

It may be stated here that for this sūtra, there is no need to go outside the C.U. for the v.v. , as Śaṅkara and other commentators have done. Śaṅkara in his commentary on this sūtra refers to a passage from the B.U. य आदित्ये तिष्ठन्नादित्यादन्तरोयमादित्यो न वेद यस्यादित्यः शरीरं य आदित्यमन्तरो यमयत्येष त आत्मान्तर्याम्यमृतः। (B.U. 3-7-9). He who dwells in the sun and within the sun, whom the sun does not know, whose body the sun is, and who rules the sun within, he is thy self, the ruler within, the immortal. Śaṅkara is conscious that he is referring to a different Śruti from the C.U. as he says श्रुत्यन्तर. As we have said earlier, as far as possible, we should restrict ourselves in searching for a v.v. from the same Upaniṣad or source from which a passage as a v.v. for an adhikaraṇa is selected. In this respect what B.N.K. Sharma observes is

significant, The keyword of the second sūtra of this adhikaraṇa 'On account of the declaration of difference' does not refer, as interpreted by S. (Śaṅkara) and R. (Rāmānuja) to any difference that is embodied in the v.v. in question in its own context. It is referred by them to a difference taught in some other passage occurring, in a different Upaniṣad altogether.'[1] We find ourselves in complete agreement with what the learned professor says regarding the v.v., though we do not endorse the v.v.s suggested by Madhva, for this adhikaraṇa. According to Madhva, the v.v. for this adhikaraṇa is from the T.Ā.

इन्द्रस्यात्मानिहित: पञ्चहोता वायोरात्मानं कवयो निचिख्यु: ।[2]

अन्तरादित्ये मनसा चरन्तं

देवानां हृदयं ब्रह्मान्वविन्दत्॥

and अन्त:प्रविष्टं कर्तारमेतमन्तश्चन्द्रमसि मनसा चरन्तम्। सहैव सन्तं न विजानन्ति देवा: ॥ (3-11-39)

Ākāśādhikaraṇam (1-1-22)

This is a one-sūtra adhikaraṇa. The sūtra is आकाशस्तल्लिङ्गात्।

The ākāśa i.e. ether (is Brahman) on account of the characteristic marks (of the later being mentioned).

This adhikaraṇa and the sūtra need not detain us any longer.

Different Upaniṣadic thinkers tried to put forth their concept of the Ultimate Reality. For some, ākāśa was the ultimate reality.

Whether they really regarded ākāśa as we know it, as the ultimate principle or they employ ākāśa only as a pratīka or symbol to convey the idea of oneness, ubiquitouses is a problem that cannot be easily settled. It was left to a thinker like Bādarāyaṇa to eke out a system of philosophy from the thoughts of different thinkers of different times and places, as found in the Upaniṣads. This Bādarāyaṇa did in the first ahead, i.e. Samanvayādhyāya by taking the stand that terms like ākāśa, Prāṇa etc. actually stand for the Highest Reality.

In the C.U. several things are identified with Brahman and the B.S. is attempting to summarise at least some of them. Ākāśa

---

1. Sharma B.N.K. The Brahmasūtras and their Principal Commentaries, A Critical Exposition Vol.1 P. 113
2. पूर्णप्रज्ञदर्शनम् p. 15

is obviously one of them. So the sūtra has this passage from the C.U.

अस्य लोकस्य का गतिरित्याकाश इति होवाच सर्वाणि ह वा इमानि भूतान्याकाशादेव समुत्पद्यन्त आकाशं प्रत्यस्तं यन्त्याकाशो ह्येवैभ्यो ज्यायानाकाश: परायणम्। (C.U. 1-9-1)

'What is the origin of this world?' 'Ether' he replied. 'For all these beings take their rise from ether only and return into the ether. Ether is greater than these, ether is their nest.'

If we view that the previous adhikaraṇa Antarādhikaraṇam (1-1-20,21) considered the adhidaivata aspect (1-6-8 C.U.) the present adhikaraṇa takes up an ādhibhautika aspect of the Highest Reality. [1]

Prāṇādhikaraṇam (1-1-23)

This adhikaraṇa also consists of one sūtra only viz., अत एव प्राण: (4-1-23). For the same reason vital breath is Brahman. As remarked earlier, the sūtra is referring to the passage from the C.U. (1-11-4,5)

कतमा सा देवतेति प्राण इति होवाच सर्वाणि ह वा इमानि भूतानि प्राणमेवाभिसंविशन्ति प्राणमभ्युज्जिहते सैषा देवता प्रस्तावमन्वायत्ता।

'Which is that divinity' 'Breath', said he. 'Verily, indeed all beings here enter (into life) with breath and depart (from life) with breath. This is the divinity belonging to the prastāva'.

In this sūtra, consideration of the adhyātma aspect of the Highest Reality is taken up as stated in the very C.U. अथ अध्यात्मम्। (C.U. 1-7-1)

Madhva bases this adhikaraṇa on the passage from the T.Ā.

तद्धै त्वं प्राणोऽभव: महान् भोग: प्रजापते:।
भुज: करिष्यमाणो यद्देवान् प्राणयो नव।। (3-14-41)[2]

You are that breath which confers on the Brahma various blessings. So you are blessed. You impel the nine gods, the senses to action.

S.N. Dasgupta takes a note of this view of Madhva as he writes, 'Madhva has, however, come to the same conclusion with

---

1. See infra Antarādhikaraṇam
2. पूर्णप्रज्ञदर्शनम् p. 23

reference to the use of the word prāṇa in another passage of the T.Ā.'[1]

Jyotiradhikaraṇam (1-1-24 to 27)

Śaṅkara and other commentators except Madhva take this adhikaraṇa as having four sūtras viz.

(i) ज्योतिश्चरणाभिधानात् (1-1-24)

(ii) छन्दोभिधानान्नेति चेन्न तथा चेतोऽर्पणनिगदात्तथा हि दर्शनम्। (1-1-25)

(iii) भूतादिव्यपदेशोपपत्तेश्चैवम्। (1-1-26)

(iv) उपदेशभेदान्नेति चेन्नोभयस्मिन्नप्यविरोधात्। (1-1-27)

Madhva takes the first sūtra as constituting a separate adhikaraṇa and the other three sūtras as constituting another adhikaraṇa. However, looking, to the wordings of the sūtras, this does not sound probable. The second sūtra (1-1-25) unmistakably refers to the preceeding sūtra as can be seen from the construction छन्दोऽभिधानात् न इति चेत् न तथा, If it be said that (Brahman is) not mentioned, since the metre is mentioned, (the answer is) not so. Generally इति चेत् also refers to pūrvapakṣa which can be stated only when a pratijñā is laid down previously. So the छन्दोऽभिधानान्नेति... cannot begin a new adhikaraṇa. For this and other reasons which we shall see in the course of the discussion, this adhikaraṇa has four sūtras viz. 24 to 27.

The sūtrakāra is continuing the discussion of the C.U. passages. This adhikaraṇa is important from a different point of view regarding the V.V.s. The first sūtra ज्योतिश्चरणाभिधानात् (1-1-24) states that (the word) light (signifies Brahman) on account of the mention of the feet. The sūtra has as the V.V. this passage अथ यदतः परो दिवो ज्योतिर्दीप्यते विश्वतः पृष्ठेषु सर्वतः पृष्ठेष्वनुत्तमेषूत्तमेषु लोकेस्विदं वाव तद्यदिदमस्मिन्नन्तः पुरुषे ज्योतिः। C.U. 3-13-7). Now the light which shines above this heaven, above all, above everything, in the highest worlds, beyond which there are no higher. Verily that is the same as this light which is here within the person. The sūtra also assigns the reason चरणाभिधानात् on account of the mention of feet. The relevant passage alluded to in the latter part of the sūtra stating the reason is तावानस्य महिमा ततो ज्यायांश्च पूरुषः। पादोऽस्य सर्वा भूतानि त्रिपादस्यामृतं दिवि। (C.U. 3-12-6)

1. History of Indian Philosophy Vol. IV p. 131

Its greatness is of such extent, yet Pūruṣa is greater still. All beings are one fourth of him. The three fourths, immortal are in the sky.

The sūtrakāra, it is interesting to note, employs the word चरण a synonym for the word पाद, in the passage referred to. Deussen noticing this tendency on the part of the sūtrakāra, observes, 'This (sūtrakāra's peculiarities) is accompanied by a special leaning to rare words and passages in which another word is frequently chosen, than that used in the passage of the Upaniṣad taken for consideration which is sometimes indicated only by this word.'[1] Trying to explain this predilection on the part of the sūtrakāra, Deussen further elucidates 'This condition of the Brahmasūtras cannot be sufficiently explained either by striving after brevity or a predilection for characteristic ways of expression. Rather must we admit that the composer or composers intentionally sought after obscurity in order to make their work treating of the secret doctrine of the Veda, inaccessible to all those to whom it was not opened up by the explanations of a teacher'[2] Belvalkar has also noticed this tendency on the part of the sūtrakāra.[3] It is interesting to note that both the scholars have cited the present sūtra, under discussion to illustrate their point.

This is further strengthened by the second sūtra of the adhikaraṇa wherein a definite and unmistakable hint about the exact location of the v.v. of the previous sūtra and the whole adhikaraṇa has been given. The sūtra is छन्दोऽभिधानान्नेति चेन्न तथा चेतोऽर्पणनिगदात्तथा हि दर्शनम्। (1-1-25) If it be argued that Brahman could not be meant on account of the mention of metre, this argument is not proper because the fixing of the mind (on Brahman) by means of the metre is mentioned here, for this is what we see. This sūtra gives the exact location of the passage

---

1. Deussen, The System of Vedānta pp 26-27
2. Ibid, p. 27
3. Belvalkar Observes 'At times, somewhat unaccountably the sūtrakāra paraphrases the original word. The reason may have been the sūtrakāra's partiality for rare words and phrases, or even a deliberate attempt at obscurity as suggested by Deussen, assuming that the commentators are right in identifying the specific passages intended by the sūtrakāra'. Shree Gopal Basu Mallik Lectures on Vedānta Philosophy p. 153.

wherein the metre is mentioned. Now the passage preceeding the one cited as the v.v. of the previous sūtra mentions the metre Gāyatrī. The passage is गायत्री वा इदं सर्व भूतं यदिदं किं च। (C.U. 3-12-1)

Verily, the Gāyatrī is all this, that has come to be, whatsoever there is here. The words तथा हि दर्शनम् in the sūtra refer to similar methods of discourses in the Upaniṣads where in order to facilitate concentration for the mind, some objects are made to stand for the Highest Reality, In other words, they serve as symbols for Brahman.

The third sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is भूतादिव्यपदेशोपपत्तेश्चैवम्। (1-1-26). Thus also, (Brahman is the topic) for the indication that the beings etc. are the feet thus be justified. This sūtra also points to the same passage taken up for discussion in this adhikaraṇa. The passage referred to in this sūtra is पादोऽस्य सर्वा भूतानि त्रिपादस्यामृतं दिवि। (C.U. 3-12-5). All beings are one foot (or quarter) of it, the three-fourths immortal is in the sky.

The fourth and the last sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is उपदेशभेदान्नेति चेन्नोभयस्मिन्नप्यविरोधात्। (1-1-27) If it be said that on account of the divergence in the teaching (Brahman cannot be the topic of discussion in the passage) the answer is that it is not so, because no contradiction is (there) in both the cases.

The sūṭrakāra continues the discussion of the passage and takes up a minor but subtle point for deliberation from the passage त्रिपादस्यामृतं दिवि. This sentence has दिवि in the locative case and in अथ यद्वत: परो दिव: । (C.U. 3-13-7) दिव: is in ablative case. One passage states heaven as the abode and another states heaven as the limit. So this is apparently a contradiction. But this contradiction does not preclude Brahman from being the topic of discussion. Śaṅkara explains this contradiction with the help of an analogy यथा लोके वृक्षाग्रेणासंबद्धोऽपि श्येन उभयथोपदिश्यमानो दृश्यते, वृक्षाग्रे श्येनो, वृक्षाग्रात्परत: श्येन इति च। एवं च दिव: परमपि सद्ब्रह्म दिवीत्युपदिश्यते।

Just as in ordinary language a falcon, although in contact with the top of a tree, is not only said to be on the tree, but also above the tree, even so Brahman being in heaven, is referred to here, as being beyond heaven also.

Madhva, as noted above, differs from other commentators and hence his v.v.s also differ. According to Madhva, the sūtra

ज्योतिश्चरणाभिधानात्। (1-1-24) constitutes a separate adhikaraṇa. The v.v. of this sūtra according to Madhva is

वि मे कर्णा पतयतो वि चक्षु वा इदं ज्योतिर्हृदय आहितं यत्

वि मे मनश्चरति दूर आधी: किं स्विद् वक्ष्यामि किमुन् मनिष्ये (Ṛgveda 6-9-46)

My ears turn away; so too my eyes from the light that is placed in the heart. The mind too strays far away. Poor soul that I am, what shall I say or think of 'that Light.'

For the next three sūtras, Madhva along with other commentators, takes the same passage i.e. C.U. 3-17-7 for consideration.

But, as noted above, Madhva's arrangement of an adhikaraṇa is not satisfactory. [1]

It may be noted, en passant, that in this adhikaraṇa, the sūtrakāra has been happily transparent about the Upaniṣadic passages alluded to in the sūtras. If the first sūtra leaves any shred of doubt about the v.v., the next one

छन्दोभिधानान्नेति... and the next भूतादिपादव्यपदेशो.... leave no scope for any ambiguity.

Pratardanādhikaraṇam (1-1-28 to 31)

This adhikaraṇa has the following four sūtras viz.

(i) प्राणस्तथानुगमात्। (1-1-28)

(ii) न वक्तुरात्मोपदेशादिति चेदध्यात्म संबन्धभूमा ह्यस्मिन्। (1-1-29)

(iii) शास्त्रदृष्ट्या तूपदेशो वामदेववत्। (1-1-30)

(iv) जीवमुख्यप्राणलिङ्गान्नेति चेन्नोपासात्रैविध्यादाश्रितत्वादिह तद्योगात्। (1-1-31)

All commentators are unanimous regarding the formation of this adhikaraṇa comprising these four sūtras.

There are innumerable passages discussing prāṇa-vital breath in the Upaniṣadic literature. However, the sūtrakāra has restricted his discussion to one passage as can be seen from his qualifying statement in the next sūtra referring to some speaker. So, now, this much is certain that the passage for the v.v. deals with some dialogue in which there is a speaker who identifies himself with

---

1. पूर्णप्रज्ञदर्शनम् — p.16

prāṇa whom he regards as the Highest Reality. T.U. refers to prāṇa extensively and there is identification of prāṇa with the Highest Reality also. (प्राणो ब्रह्मेति व्यजानात्। प्राणाद्ध्येव खल्विमानि भूतानि जायन्ते। प्राणेन जातानि जीवन्ति। प्राणं प्रयन्त्यभिसंविशन्तीति। तद्विजिज्ञासस्व T.U. 3-1-3 and so on). There is a vaktā also. Yet this passage cannot form the v.v. of this adhikaraṇa because there is no identification of the speaker with either prāṇa or the Highest Reality.

The P.U. also refers to prāṇa in the second and the third questions. But there is no attempt at identification of prāṇa with the Highest Reality. Similarly the speaker also does not identify himself with the Highest Reality.

So both these sets of passages can be ruled out with the help of the identification mark inserted in the second sūtra of the adhikaraṇa, this being wanting in both the passages alluded to above. On the same ground, other passages also cannot be accepted as v.v.. So it seems certain that the sūtrakāra is referring to the Pratardanākhyāyikā in the Kau. U., wherein Indra, the speaker identifies himself with prāṇa as stated in the second sūtra. And the whole story of Pratardana deals with prāṇa only. So the story of Pratardana is under consideration in this adhikaraṇa.

The first sūtra is प्राणस्तथानुगमात् (1-1-28). Prāṇa (is Brahman) on account of connection. A connected consideration of the passages referring to prāṇa (Kau.U. 3-1-2,8) establishes prāṇa as Brahman. It cannot be treated as breath, or modification of air, or the individual soul or the self of some divinity. The different passages should be connected as constituting a whole if prāṇa is to be taken as Brahman. The sūtra refers to this story of Pratardana.

प्रतर्दनो ह वै दैवोदासिरिन्द्रस्य प्रियं धामोपजगाम युद्धेन च पौरुषेण च।... स होवाच। मामेव विजानीहि। एतदेवाहं मनुष्याय हिततमं मन्ये यन्मां विजानीयात्। स यो मां विजानीयान्नास्य केन च कर्मणा लोको मीयते। न मातृवधेन न पितृवधेन न स्तेयेन न भ्रूणहत्यया। स होवाच। प्राणोऽस्मि प्रज्ञात्मा। तं मामायुरमृतमित्युपास्स्व।

Pratardana, the son of Divodāsa, verily, by means of fighting and effort, arrived at the favourite dwelling of Indra..... He then said, 'Understand me only. That is what I deem most beneficial for mankind, namely that one should understand me... So he who knows me thus by no deed whatsoever, of his is his world injured, not by the killing of his mother, not by the killing of his father,

not, by stealing, not by killing an embryo.' He verily said, 'I am the breathing spirit, meditate on me as the intelligent self, as life, as immortality.'

This topic of Prāṇa is throughout connected in the relevant portion of the Kau. U. Śaṅkara explains the meaning of अनुगम thus : पौर्वापर्येण पर्यालोच्यमाने वाक्ये पदार्थानां समन्वयो ब्रह्मप्रतिपादनपर उपलभ्यते।...सर्वमेतत्परस्मिन्ब्रह्मण्याश्रीयमाणेऽनुगन्तुं शक्यते न मुख्ये प्राणे। तस्मात्प्राणो ब्रह्म।

If we examine the connection of the entire section which treats of the prāṇa, we observe that all the single passages can be construed into a whole only if they are viewed as referring to Brahman... All this can be properly understood only if the Highest Brahman is acknowledged to be the subject matter of the whole chapter and not of the vital air. Hence the word prāṇa denotes Brahman.

This meaning as taken by Śaṅkara is the most logical and possible meaning. But at the same time, we may venture to point out the possibility of the sūtrakāra being influenced by the context of the Upaniṣad in composing the sūtra the way in which it is done. The passage quoted below follows the passage taken as the v.v. of the sūtra and adhikaraṇa. The passage having so many अनु runs as follows :

एकैकमेतानि सर्वाण्येव प्रज्ञापयन्ति। वाचं वदन्तीं सर्वे प्राणा अनुवदन्ति। चक्षुः पश्यत्सर्वे प्राणा अनुपश्यन्ति। श्रोत्रं शृण्वत्सर्वे प्राणा अनु शृण्वन्ति। मनो ध्यायत्सर्वे प्राणा अनुध्यायन्ति। प्राणं प्राणन्तं सर्वे प्राणा अनुप्राणन्तीति। (Kau.U. 3-2)

Therefore, they bring every one of these to consciousness, one after another. When the speech speaks, all the life-forces speak following it, and when the eyes see, all the life-forces see following them, when the ears hear, all the life-forces hear following them, when the Manas thinks, all the lifeforces think following it and when the breath breathes, all the lifeforces breathe following it.[1]

Now this अनु connection in this sense derived from the passage just referred to has not been noticed by the

---

1. Tran. by Paul Deussen, Sixty Upaniṣads of the Veda, Vol.1. 1980 p.45-46

commentators. But the context makes it plausible that the sūtrakāra might have had this passage in mind when he framed the sūtra.

If this be accepted, this provides a formidable proof against the passage from the A.Ā (2-1-14) being accepted as the v.v. of the adhikaraṇa as done by Madhva. Madhva has chosen the following passage as v.v.s from the A.Ā.

ता वा एता: शीर्षन् श्रिय: श्रिता: चक्षु: श्रोत्रम् (2-1-4)

प्राणो वा अहमस्मृषे, प्राणस्त्वम्, प्राण: सर्वाणि भूतानि। (2-2-3)

(A.A. 2-2-3) They are Śriyaḥ, the eye, ear, have their place in the head... O sage, I am verily prāṇa, you are prāṇa, prāṇa is all these beings.

B.N.K Sharma puts up a case for accepting this passage as the v.v. and rejecting the V.V. selected by Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja and others. He says 'In keeping with the phrase', 'On account of denoting himself' आत्मोपदेशात् used in the sūtra, it seems more reasonable to take '*asmin*' there to refer to Indra himself than to take it to mean 'in that chapter! In the same way, it seems pointless to take 'vaktúḥ in sūtra 29 as referring to the speaker viz. Indra, as Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja have done. The 'speaker' is already implicated in the phrase आत्मोपदेशात् (by denoting himself). It would be needless to refer to him again by the word vaktuḥ. This is a very strong indication indeed that by putting in this word here, Bādarāyaṇa wants us to understand that he is thinking of an altogether different viṣayavākya in which the person addressed by the instructor (upadeṣṭā) happens to be a vaktā or reciter of something special.[1] This is hardly convincing. The argument put forward by the learned scholar moves in a circle. Because B.N.K. Sharma wants us to accept the passage from the A.Ā. in which a vaktā recites something as the v.v., he argues that Bādarāyaṇa wants us to understand; that the person addressed by the instructor happens to be a vaktā or reciter of something special. And this not being the case in the v.v. accepted by Śaṅkara, i.e. vaktā is not a reciter of something special, (Pratardana does not recite anything,) the passage from the Kau. U. cannot be the v.v. B.N.K. Sharma has almost conceded the position adopted by

1. The Brahmasūtras and their commentaries Vol. 1, p. 129

Śaṅkara and others when he says 'Tho' (sic) the principles of interpretation enunciated in the sūtras 29 and 30 are capable of being applied with equal force to the other dialogue between Indra and Pratardana in the Kau.U. and others of the same kind elsewhere, in the Upaniṣads, by upalakṣaṇa and 'atideśa, there is, as we have seen, special propriety in basing the discussion here as certain sections of the A.Ā. There is no reason to think, however, that, Madhva, is fighting shy of the passages from the Kau.U. chosen by Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja.[1] It does give the impression that Madhva, just to differ from Śaṅkara and other commentators, chooses an entirely different v.v. for the adhikaraṇa.

The remaining sūtras do not warrant any discussion as there is no controversy or doubt regarding the v.v. of the individual sūtras. The whole of the Pratardanākhyāyikā is the v.v. of the adhikaraṇa as well as the sūtras, excepting the passage suggested by us as the v.v. of the first sūtra.

1-2

Sarvatraprasiddhādhikaraṇam (1-2-1 to 8)

The adhikaraṇa comprises the following eight sūtras viz.

(i) सर्वत्र प्रसिद्धोपदेशात्। (1-2-1)

(ii) विवक्षितगुणोपपत्तेश्च। (1-2-2)

(iii) अनुपपत्तेस्तु न शारीरः। (1-2-3)

(iv) कर्मकर्तृव्यपदेशाच्च। (1-2-4)

(v) शब्दविशेषात्। (1-2-5)

(vi) स्मृतेश्च। (1-2-6)

(vii) अर्भकौकस्त्वात्तद्व्यपदेशाच्च नेति चेन्न निचाय्यत्वादेवं व्योमवच्च। (1-2-7)

(viii) संभोगप्राप्तिरिति चेन्न वैशेष्यात्। (1-2-8)

Belvalkar who has given much thought to the text of the Brahmasūtras thinks that the sūtra 5 has to be omitted because it refers apparently to the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa and sūtra 6 has to be omitted as it cites the authority of a Smṛti.[2]

---

1. The Brahmasūtras and their commentaries Vol. 1, p. 132, fn. 27
2. Belvalkar S.K. Shree Gopal Basu Mallik Lectures on Vedānta Philosophy p.143

Further he is doubtful whether sūtras 7-8 should not constitute a distinct adhikaraṇa.[1] Apart from this discussion, most of the sūtras of this adhikaraṇa do not seem to offer any clue regarding the v.v.s, as they (the sūtras) are worded in the commonest fashion. So one is not sure about a particular v.v. intended by Bādarāyaṇa. However, in such an eventuality, we have to fall back upon the tradition as preserved in the commentaries. Most of the commentaries regard this passage as the v.v.

सर्वं खलिवदं ब्रह्म तज्जलानिति शान्त उपासीत। अथ खलु क्रतुमय:
पुरुषो यथाक्रतुरस्मिंल्लोके पुरुषो भवति तथेत: प्रेत्य भवति स क्रतुं कुर्वीत।
मनोमय: प्राणशरीरो भारूप: सत्यसंकल्प आकाशात्मा सर्वकर्मा सर्वगन्ध:
सर्वरस: सर्वमिदमभ्यात्तोऽवाक्यनादर:। (C.U. 3-14, 1,2)

Verily this whole world is Brahman, from which comes forth Tranquil, one should meditate on it. Now verily, a person consists of purpose. According to the purpose, a person has in this world, so does he become on departing hence. So let him frame for himself a purpose. He who consists of mind, whose body is life, whose form is light, whose conception is truth, whose soul is space, containing all works, containing all desires, containing all odours, containing all tastes, encompassing this whole world, being without speech and without concern.

Tradition seems to be correct except in the fact that, the sūtra, though considering the entire passage, is based on the later portion, particularly the portion of the second passage viz. सर्वकर्मा सर्वकाम: सर्वगन्ध: सर्वरस: सर्वमिदमभ्यात्तोऽवाक्यनादर:।

And this has not been duly emphasized in the commentaries. The word सर्व in the sūtra undoubtedly refers to the word सर्व and सर्वम् in the passage. Śaṅkara explains the sūtra as follows : यत्सर्वेषु वेदान्तेषु प्रसिद्धं ब्रह्मशब्दस्यालम्बनं जगत्कारणम्। इह च सर्वं खल्विदं ब्रह्म इति वाक्योपक्रमे श्रुतं तदेव मनोमयत्वादिधर्मैर्विशिष्टमुपदिश्यते इति युक्तम्।

What is known from all the Vedānta-passages to be the sense of the word Brahman, i.e. the cause of the world, and what is mentioned here in the beginning of the passage, 'all this verily is Brahman,' the same we must assume to be taught here as

1. Belvalkar S.K. Shree Gopal Basu Mallik Lectures on Vedānta Philosophy.

distinguished by certain qualities, i.e. consisting of mind and so on.

So the tradition is only slightly inaccurate in not pinpointing the later portion of the passage cited above. This consideration is based upon the assumption that the sūtrakāra as is his wont sometimes, has employed the word सर्वत्र for सर्व. P. M. Modi, noting this proclivity on the part of the sūtrakāra observes, 'But, if we study how the sūtrakāra refers to śrutis or to the sūtras, we come to a (sic) conclusion that, he does make changes. Thus चरण in B.S. 1-1-24 (ज्योतिश्चरणाभिधानात्) refers to a Śruti,[1] viz. 3-12-6. सर्वत्र in B.S. 1-2-1 refers to सर्वमिदमभ्यात्त: in C.U. 3-14-2 (underlined ours), अर्भकौकस्त्व in B.S. 1-2-7 refers to एष मे आत्मान्तर्हृदये in 3-14-3, व्योमवत् in B.S. 1-2-7 refers to a Śruti in which the word आकाश occurs viz. C.U. 8-1-1 (अथ यदिदमस्मिन्ब्रह्मपरे दहरं पुण्डरीक वेश्म दहरोऽस्मिन्नन्तराकाश: । All these examples used by the sūtrakāra for making references to śrutis show that he makes changes in the words occurring in the original passages.'[2] So now it cannot be urged against this interpretation by saying that 'It deserves to be noted that the expression used in the sūtra is sarvatra and not sarvam. Had the sūtrakāra wanted to establish here that Brahman is of the nature of all (sarvātmaka), he would have used an appropriate word for it viz. Sarvam following the reading of the śruti (*Sarvam Khalvidam Brahma*) cited as v.v. by Rāmānuja and as interpreted by him. But he has used instead the expression 'sarvatra' which means 'everywhere' and not 'everything' (is Brahman) as has been actually done by B. N. K. Sharma.[3]

P.M. Modi further adduces a more subtle and sound reason for regarding the above-referred to passage as the v. v. He elucidates, 'In sūtra 11 (आनन्दादय: 3-3-11) we have a group of attributes viz. आनन्दादय:. Thus we have here in sūtras 11 and 39 (3-3-39 सत्यादय:कामादितरत्र तत्र चायतनादिभ्य: । three groups of attributes viz. (1) One beginning with आनन्द (2) a second beginning with सत्य

---

1. See infra, the discussion on the sūtra 1-1-24
2. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra Part I p. 171
3. Sharma B.N.K., The Brahmasūtras and Their Principal Commentaries Vol.1 p. 147

and (3) a third group of attributes of which आयतन is the first..........

To us it seems that here the sūtrakāra refers to the lists of attributes in the first three pādas of the first adhyāya of his work. आनन्द is an attribute referred to in B.S. 1-1-2. Similarly सत्य is the first attribute in B.S. 1-2. But in this case, सत्य stands for सत्यसंकल्प which is given in the Śruti referred to in B.S. 1-2-1 (that is the present sūtra under consideration). In the same way आयतनादिभ्य: refers to a list in which is the first attribute of Brahman. This seems to be a reference to द्युभ्वाद्यायतन in the first sūtra of the third pāda of the first adhyāya of the Brahmasūtra.'[1]

Thus sufficient grounds exist to consider the C.U. 3-14-1,2 as the v.v. of the sūtra सर्वत्र प्रसिद्धोपदेशात्।

As everywhere well-known Brahman is taught (so here).

Madhva's v.v. is different i.e. स यश्चायम् शरीर: प्रज्ञात्मा। (A.Ā. 3-2-3). B.N.K. Sharma explains the position of Madhva in this way 'In the previous adhikaraṇa, it was shown that Brahman is all-pervasive.' (Brahma tatamam A.Ā. 2-4-3). The same has been further celebrated in the next Āraṇyaka in this way : 'Him the Bahvṛcas laud in the great Uktha (Bṛhatīsahasra), the adhvaryus in Agni, the Chāndogas in the Mahāvrata Stotra. The wise ones proclaim Him to be present in this earth, in heaven, in the wind, the sky, the waters, herbs, trees, moon and the stars. In all these beings they declare him to be existing as Brahman'[2] (A.A. 3-2-3)

The second sūtra is विवक्षितगुणोपपत्तेश्च (1-2-2) And because qualities desired to be expressed would justifiably be there (in Brahman). The sūtra has in view the same passage referring to the qualities मनोमय: प्राणशरीरो भारूप: सत्यसंकल्प आकाशात्मा सर्वकर्मा सर्वगन्ध: सर्वरस: सर्वमिदमभ्यात्तोऽवाक्यनादर:। (C.U. 3-14-1,2) Constituted of mind, having Prāṇa as the body, having a refulgent form, having thoughts fulfilled, the Ātman of Ākāśa, all-doer, having all desires, all-fragrance, all-flavour, he has reached all this, speechless, regardless.[3]

---

1. Modi P.M., A critique of the Brahusūtra Part I p. 170
2. Sharma B.N.K., the Brahmasūtras and their Principal Commentaries, Vol. 1, p. 149
3. Tran. by R.D. Karmarkar, Śrībhāṣya of Rāmānuja Part II p. 338

All these qualities that are intended to be mentioned in the passage could be appropriate in Brahman only.

As Madhva has taken an altogether different passage as the v.v. of the adhikaraṇa v.v. of the sūtra also will be different. He quotes from some चतुर्वेदशिखा [1]

The third sūtra is अनुपपत्तेस्तु न शारीरः। (1-2-3). On the other hand as (the qualities desired to be expressed) are not possible (in the individual soul), it is not the embodied one. This sūtra also refers to the same passage in which qualities are enumerated. These qualities cannot be said to belong to the individual soul. So this is an additional reason why the passage refers to Brahman only.

According to Madhva, as explained by B.N.K Sharma, 'The expression Śārīra used in this sūtra goes to show that the being referred to in the v.v. 'śārīra prajñātmā' (A.A. 3-2-2) cannot be equated with the individual self.[2]

The fourth sūtra is कर्मकर्तृव्यपदेशाच्च (1-2-4) And because object and agent are (separately) mentioned. This has a reference to a portion of the passage under consideration wherein, agent and his object are separately mentioned. This portion is एतमितः प्रेत्याभिसंभावितास्मि। (C.U. 3-14-4) Into him, I shall enter, on departing, hence.

This sentence is uttered by Śāṇḍilya in the passage concerned. This sentence refers to an agent and the action.

According to Madhva, this sūtra shows that in the text ātmānam parasmai śaṁsati (A.A. 3-2-3) the subject of the discourse is Brahman and the jīva is the exponent. [3]

Vallabha, thinks that the adhikaraṇa closes here and from the next sūtra a fresh adhikaraṇa starts. According to him, the sūtra also indicates the completion of an adhikaraṇa अधिकरणसंपूर्णत्वद्योतकश्च।[4]

The fifth sūtra is शब्दविशेषात् (1-2-5) On account of the special word. The passage under discussion should contain a special

---

1. पूर्णप्रज्ञदर्शनम् p. 20
2. Sharma B.N.K. The Brahmasūtras and their Principal Commentaries Vol.1 p. 142
3. पूर्णप्रज्ञदर्शनम् p. 20
4. श्रीमद् ब्रह्मसूत्राणुभाष्यम्। p. 83

word which should remove all doubts about the Highest Reality, if there remains any. It is quite logical that now the sūtrakāra should refer to the word Brahman to set at rest any doubt about the well-known Brahman, invoked everywhere, in the Upaniṣads when Śāṇḍilya specifically states Into him I shall enter him refers to Brahman. The passage runs thus एष म आत्माऽन्तर्हदय एतद्ब्रह्मएतमित: प्रेत्य......

... and so on. So on account of the special mention of Brahman. Moreover, if we understand the general drift of the adhikaraṇa and the sūtras of it, then, the context of the Upaniṣad also points out to the interpretation of the sūtra we have presented here. The fourteenth section is rounded off with the assertion of Śāṇḍilya यस्य स्यादद्धा न विचिकित्सास्तीति ह स्माह शाण्डिल्य: शाण्डिल्य:। (C.U. 3-14-4)

Verily, who believes this, will have no more doubts. Thus spoke Śāṇḍilya, Śāṇḍilya,

If we accept this interpretation of the sūtra then, we can avoid the contingency of removing this sūtra from the text because the sūtra refers to the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, as suggested by Belvalkar.[1] Traditionally, according to Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja and Vallabha, the sūtra refers to the passage from the S.B. यथा व्रीहिर्वा यवो वा श्यामाको वा श्यामाकतण्डुलो वैवमयमन्तरात्मन्पुरुषो हिरण्मय:। (S.B. 10-6-3-2)

Like a rice grain, or a barley grain, or a millet grain, or the kernel of a grain of a millet, thus that golden person is the self. According to Belvalkar, as this sūtra refers to a passage not located in the C.U. and thus breaking the continuity, it might not be in the original text of the Brahmasūtra. But if our suggestion and interpretation is accepted, then, we have not to go out of the C.U. for the v.v. and we can retain the sūtra.

Further, a strikingly similar passage to that of the S.B. is there in the very passage we are considering. The passage in the 13th section of the C.U. with slight variation एष म आत्माऽन्तर्हृदयेऽणीयान्व्रीहे श्यामाकाद्वा श्यामाकतण्डुलाद्वैष वा यवाद्वा सर्षपाद्वा म आत्माऽन्तर्हदयो ज्यायान्पृथिव्या ज्यायानन्तरिक्षाज्जायायान्दिवो ज्यायानेभ्यो लोकेभ्य:।

---

1. Belvalkar S.K., Shree Gopal Basu Mallik Lectures on Vedānta Philosophy p. 43

This is my self, within the heart, smaller than a grain of rice, than a barley grain, than a mustard-seed, than a grain of millet or than the kernel of a grain of a millet. This is myself within the heart, greater than the earth, greater than the atmosphere, greater than the sky, greater than these worlds.

So taking into consideration this passage also, one need not go out of the C.U. in search of a v.v. for this sūtra.

Madhva of course, quotes from some इन्द्रद्युम्नशाखा, i.e.
एष नु एष ब्रह्मैव उ एवात्मैष उ एवेन्द्रो उ एव हरिर्हरति परः परमानन्दः।

The sixth sūtra is स्मृतेश्च (1-1-6) And on account of smṛti Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja and Vallabha refer to this passage from the Gītā

ईश्वरः सर्वभूतानां हृद्देशेऽर्जुन तिष्ठति।
भ्रामयन्सर्वभूतानि यन्त्रारूढानि मायया।। (B.G. 18-61) The Lord, O Arjuna, is seated in the heart of all beings, driving round by his magical power all beings (as if they were) mounted on a machine.

This passage from the B.G. is quite consistent with the passage quoted from the C.U. in the previous sūtra. The reasoning that because a sūtra cites the authority of a smṛti, it should be omitted is not convincing and hence, we prefer retaining the sūtra to omitting it.[1]

The seventh sūtra is अर्भकौकस्त्वात्तद्व्यपदेशाच्च नेति चेन्न निचाय्यत्वादेवं व्योमवच्च। (1-2-7) If it be said that (the passage does) not (refer to Brahman) on account of the smallness of the abode (mentioned), and on account of the denotations of that (i.e. of minuteness). We say, no, because (Brahman) has thus to be contemplated and because the case is analogous to that of the ether.

The sūtra seems to be clearly pointing to the passage of the C.U. to which we have referred in the previous sūtra

एष म आत्माऽन्तर्हृदयेऽणीयान्व्रीहेर्वा, यवाद्वा सर्षपाद्वा श्यामाकाद्वा श्यामाकतण्डुलाद्वैष म आत्माऽन्तर्हृदये ज्यायान्पृथिव्या ज्यायानन्तरिक्षाज्ज्यायान्दिवो ज्यायानेभ्यो लोकेभ्यः।

The passage seems to be the proper v.v. of the sūtra, if we take into account the sūtrakāra's tendency to use the less familiar words in composing the sūtra. The heart is said to be the abode of

1. See, infra, the beginning of this pāda.

the self. How can such Omnipresent Brahman be said to be abiding within a small place like heart? The sūtra removes that doubt referring to the above cited passages. For the purpose of meditation, the Omnipresent Brahman may be said to be abiding even within a small place like the heart for the purpose of meditation. This sūtra also provides an illustration. This could be a reference to the passage as pointed out by P.M. Modi.

अथ यदिदमस्मिन्ब्रह्मपुरे दहरं पुण्डरीकं वेश्म दहरोऽस्मिन्नन्तराकाशः। तस्मिन्यदन्तस्तदन्वेष्टव्यम्। (C.U. 8-1-1) Now here, in this city of Brahman is an abode, a small lotus flower, within it is a small space. What is within that should be sought.

Of course Śaṅkara has explained the व्योमवच्च without referring to any passage as यथा सर्वगतमपि सद्व्योम सूचीपाशाद्यपेक्षयार्भकौकोऽणीयश्च व्यपदिश्यते एवं ब्रह्मापि।

The ether, though all pervading is spoken of aṣ limited and minute if considered in its connection with the eye of a needle, so Brahman also.

The last sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is संभोगप्राप्तिरिति चेन्न वैशेष्यात्। (1-2-8) If it be said that (the Universal will be subject to the experience (of pleasure and pain), no, since, there is a difference in nature (of the Universal self and individual soul).

The sūtra obviously refers to the same passage with which we started the discussion in this adhikaraṇa.

मनोमयः प्राणशरीरो भारूपः सत्यसंकल्पआकाशात्मा सर्वकर्मा सर्वकामः सर्वगन्धः सर्वमिदमभ्यात्तोऽवाक्यादरः।

It may be noted that Śaṅkara does not refer to this passage. He takes the sūtra in a general sense not referring to any particular v.v.

Rāmānuja refers to the passage from the M.U.

तयोरन्यः पिप्पलं स्वाद्वत्त्यनश्नन्नन्योऽभिचाकशीति।

One of those who eats the sweet fruit of the Pippala and not eating, another continues to look on.

But the passage which we have discussed ideally suits the context of the adhikaraṇa as well as the C.U.

Attādhikaraṇam (1-2-9-10)

Except Rāmānuja, Śaṅkara and other commentators think that this adhikaraṇa consists of two sūtras only viz.

(i) अत्ता चराचरगहणात्। (1-2-9) and प्रकरणाच्च। (1-2-10).

Rāmānuja thinks that this adhikaraṇa is comprised of four sūtras, the other two being viz.

(i) गुहां प्रविष्टावात्मानौ हि तद्दर्शनात्। (-1.2-11) and

(ii) विशेषणाच्च। (1-2-12).

Now if we take into consideration the topics discussed in the first two sūtras and the following two sūtras which according to Rāmānuja, are included in a single adhikaraṇa and should not be included in one adhikaraṇa. It may be stated that, according to Śaṅkara and other commentators except Madhva, the Attādhikaraṇa has the passage from the Kaṭha U.

यस्य ब्रह्म च क्षत्रं चोभे भवत ओदनः।

मृत्युर्यस्योपसेचनं क इत्था वेद यत्र सः॥

as the v.v. This passage is immediately followed by the passage

ऋतं पिबन्तौ सुकृतस्य लोके गुहां प्रविष्टौ परमे परार्धे।

छायातपौ ब्रह्मविदो वदन्ति पञ्चाग्नयो ये च त्रिणाचिक्तेताः॥

In the Upaniṣad there is a continuity. So, one may be inclined to accept the arrangement of the sūtras as proposed by Rāmānuja. But the difference in the topics discussed in the sūtras make the sūtras 1-2-11 and 1-2-12 as forming a separate adhikaraṇa.

So it is preferable to accept the arrangement of the Sūtras suggested by Śaṅkara.

What could be the v.v. of this adhikaraṇa? The adhikaraṇa has two sūtras viz. (i) अत्ता चराचरग्रहणात् (1-2-9) and (ii) प्रकरणाच्च। (1-2-10). The first sūtra refers to The eater (is the Highest Self) on account of the taking in of (whatever is) movable and immovable. Following our usual method of ascertaining the v.v. in the sūtra, we find that चराचर is a general term encompassing all movable and immovable things in the creation; and the word चराचर as it is, rarely occurs in the Upaniṣadic literature. S.U. has स्थावरस्य च चरस्य च in 3-18 but the context does not refer to any devourer अत्ता. The word अत्ता also is of a rare occurrence in the Upaniṣads. The B.U. has this word twice in the passages सर्वस्यैतस्यात्ता भवति। (1-2-5) and सर्वस्यात्ता भवति। (2-2-4). Madhva has, in fact, accepted the v.v. of this adhikaraṇa from the B.U. 1-2-5. The passage runs as follows;

स तया वाचा तेनात्मनेदं सर्वमसृजत यदिदं किञ्चर्चो यजूंषि सामानि छन्दांसि यज्ञान्प्रजा: पशून्। स यद्यदेवासृजत तत्तदत्तुमध्रियत। सर्वं वा अत्तीति तददितेरदितित्वम्। सर्वस्यैतस्यात्ता भवति सर्वमस्यान्नं भवति य एवमेतदितेरदितित्वं वेद। (B.U. 1-2-5) With that speech, with that self he brought forth all this whatsoever exists here (the hymns of) the Ṛgveda (the formulas of) the Yajurveda and (the chants of) the Sāmaveda, the metres, the sacrifices, men and cattle. Whatever he brought forth, that he resolved to eat. Verily, because he eats everything, therefore the aditinature of Aditi. He who knows thus the aditinature of aditi, becomes an eater of everything here and everything becomes food for him.[1] One is almost tempted to accept this passage as the v.v. of the adhikaraṇa and the sūtra. But on a closer perusal of the context, of the passage and of the sūtras as well, one is disinclined to choose this as the v.v. In the earlier passages preceeding the one under consideration, the process of creation is considered स त्रेधात्मानं व्यकुरुतादित्य तृतीयं वायु तृतीयम्। स एष प्राणस्त्रेधा विहित:। and so on. Then further सोऽकामयत द्वितीयो म आत्मा जायेतेति। स मनसा वाचं मिथुनं समभवदशनाया मृत्यु:। (B.U. 1-2-4). He divided himself three-fold (fire in one third), the sun one third and the air one-third. He also is life divided threefold... He desired, let a second self (body or form) born of me. He, hunger or death, brought about the union of speech by mind.

Thus here, मृत्यु or death is being described. This death referred to in the above quoted passage is further described in the present passage adopted as the v.v. of the sūtra by Madhva. So in the original context of the passages of the B.U., there is no highest Reality being discussed.

Now in the context of the sūtras, we know that, those passages which are related to the highest reality are being discussed in the sūtras.[2]

---

1. Translation by Radhkrishnan, the Principal Upaniṣads, pub. George Allen and Unwin Ltd. London, 1953
2. (i) अत्रास्पष्टब्रह्मलिङ्गयुक्तवाक्याणामुपास्यब्रह्मविषयाणां विचार:। ब्रह्मसूत्रशाङ्करभाष्यम् —श्रीमद्ब्रह्मसूत्रोपन्यास: ed. by N.R. Acharya, NSP

   (ii) Rāmānuja points out that तत्रास्पष्टजीवादिलिङ्गकानि वाक्यानि द्वितीये पादे विचार्यन्ते।

Moreover, the previous adhikaraṇa discussed the सर्वत्र प्रसिद्ध ब्रह्म and here also, the discussion about Brahman continues. Further, in the following adhikaraṇa a discussion about Brahman is taken up. So the passage from B.U. selected by Madhva as the v.v. of the adhikaraṇa is not acceptable.

So the v.v. of the sūtra अत्ता चराचरग्रहणात्। (1-2-9) The eater (is the Highest Self) on account of the taking in of (whatever is) movable and immovable, is as follows:

He for whom priestly class and warrior class both are as food and death is as a sauce, who knows where he is?

The second sūtra is प्रकरणाच्च (1-2-10) and on account of the topic under discussion. The sūtra refers to the context of the Kaṭha U., wherein, the Supreme Self is being discussed. This may be as suggested by Śaṅkara.

न जायते म्रियते वा विपश्चिन्नायं कुतश्चिन्न बभूव कश्चित्।

अजो नित्यः शाश्वतोऽयं पुराणो न हन्यते हन्यमाने शरीरे।। (Kaṭha U. 1-2-18)

The knowing self is never born, nor does he die at any time. He arose from nothing and nothing arose from him. He is unborn, eternal, abiding and ancient. He is not slain when the body is slain.

Rāmānuja also refers to the passages from the same section viz.

महान्तं विभुमात्मानं मत्वा धीरो न शोचति। (1-2-22)

नायमात्मा प्रवचनेन लभ्यो न मेधया न बहुना श्रुतेन।

यमेवैष वृणुते तेन लभ्यस्तस्यैष आत्मा विवृणुते तनूं स्वाम्।। (1-2-23)

Knowing the self who is great, all pervading the wise man does not grieve.

The self cannot be attained by instruction, nor by intellectual power, not even through much hearing. He is to be attained by the one whom the (self) chooses. To such a one the self reveals his own nature.

But these passages referred to by Rāmānuja do not pointedly glorify Brahman as the one suggested by Śaṅkara. So Śaṅkara's passage is preferred to that of Rāmānuja.

Vallabha also follows Śaṅkara.

Guhādhikaraṇam (1-2-11, 12)

This adhikaraṇa too comprises the following two sūtras viz.

(i) गुहां प्रविष्टावात्मानौ हि तद्दर्शनात्। (1-2-11).

(ii) विशेषणाच्च। (1-2-12)

2.1 This adhikaraṇa does not warrant any discussion as far as the v.v. is concerned. The Sūtrakāra has taken the words गुहां प्रविष्टौ directly from the Kaṭha U. The passage runs as follows:

ऋतं पिबन्तौ सुकृतस्य लोके गुहां प्रविष्टौ परमे परार्धे।

छायातपौ ब्रह्मविदो वदन्ति पञ्चाग्नयो ये च त्रिणाचिकेताः ।। (Kaṭha U. 1-3-1)

There are two selves that drink the fruit of Karma in the world of good deeds. Both have entered the secret place (of the heart) the chief seat of the Supreme. The knowers of Brahman speak of them as shade and light as also (the householders) who maintain the five sacrificial fires and those too who perform the triple Naciketas fire.

So this is the v.v. of the first sūtra गुहां प्रविष्टावात्मानौ हि (1-2-11) The two who have entered into the cave are the selves (the individual and the supreme self) because that is seen (in the śruti). All the commentators are unanimous about this passage being the v.v.

The second sūtra of the adhikaraṇa विशेषणाच्च। (1-2-12) And on account of the distinctive qualities (mentioned). The sūtra refers to such passage of the Kaṭha U. which indicates the special qualities of the individuals soul from the supreme self. The passage i.e.

आत्मानं रथिनं विद्धि शरीरं रथमेव तु।

बुद्धिं तु सारथिं विद्धि मनः प्रग्रहमेव च॥

इन्द्रियाणि हयानाहुर्विषयांस्तेषु गोचरान्।

आत्मेन्द्रियमनो युक्तं भोक्तेत्याहुर्मनीषिणः॥ (Kaṭha U. 1-3,3,4)

Know the self as the lord of the chariot; and body, as indeed, the chariot, know the intellect as the charioteer and mind as, indeed the reins. The senses, they say, are the horses, the objects of sense the paths (they travel over) the self associated with the body, the senses and the mind; wise men declare, is the enjoyer.

So this passage which distinguishes jīva from Brahman is the v.v. of the sūtra. If we want to further narrow down the choice out of these two verses, then the second verse (1-3-4) may be

preferred as it refers to the jīva as an enjoyer. Of course, the two verses form a unit and have a continuity of thought, as the metaphor of the chariot continues in the second verse also.

Antarādhikaraṇam (1-2-13 to 17)

This adhikaraṇa has the following five sūtras viz.

(i) अन्तर उपपत्तेः। (1-2-13).

(ii) स्थानादिव्यपदेशाच्च। (1-2-14)

(iii) सुखविशिष्टाभिधानादेव च। (1-2-16)

(iv) श्रुतोपनिषत्कगत्यभिधानाच्च। (1-2-16)

(v) अनवस्थितेरसंभवाच्च नेतरः। (1-2-17)

The first sūtra is अन्तर उपपत्तेः (1-2-13) The person within (the eye is Brahman) on account of the tenability. Śaṅkara and others following him take the passage य एषोऽक्षिणि पुरुषो दृश्यते एष आत्मेति होवाचेतदमृतमभयमेतद्ब्रह्मेति। (C.U. 4-15-1) He said, 'the person who is seen in the eye he is the self. This is immortal, the fearless, this is Brahman'.

Further in the second sūtra it is argued that the person within the eye is Brahman on account of the declaration of the place and other things स्थानादिव्यपदेशाच्च। (1-2-14). The context of the passage cited in the previous sūtra and the wording of the present sūtra determine the subsequent passage in the C.U. 4-15-5 as the v.v. in which the place and other things are declared. The citation of the whole passage will throw light on the issue.

अथ यदु चैवास्मिञ्छव्यं कुर्वन्ति यदि च नार्चिषमेवाभिसंभवन्त्यचिर्षोऽहरह्न आपूर्यमाणपक्षमापूर्यमाणपक्षाद्यान्षडुदङेति मासांस्तान्मासेभ्यः संवत्सरं संवत्सरादित्यमादित्याच्चन्द्रमसं चन्द्रमसो विद्युतं तत्पुरुषोऽमानवः स एनान्ब्रह्म गमयत्येष देवपथो ब्रह्मपथ एतेन प्रतिपद्यमाना इतं मानवमावर्तं नावर्तन्ते नावर्तन्ते। (C.U. 4-15-5)

Now for such a one whether they perform the cremation obsequies or not, he goes to light, from light into the day, from the day into the half month of the waxing moon, from the half month of the waxing moon into the six months, when the sun moves northwards, from the months into the year, from the year into the sun, from the sun into the moon, from the moon into lightning. Then there is person, not human. He leads them to Brahman. This is the way to the gods, the way to Brahman. Those

who proceed by it do not return to the human condition, yea , they do not return.

In the passage it may be remarked, the places and the time included in other things आदि in the sūtra, are stated. So in all likelihood, this might be the passage as the V.V. of this sūtra स्थानादिव्यपदेशाच्च।

Now most of the commentators following Śaṅkara, have seen the V.V. of this sūtra in the passage from the B.U.

यः पृथिव्यां तिष्ठन्...यः चक्षुषि तिष्ठन् (B.U. 3-7-3).

However, Vallabha takes as v.v. a passage from the C.U. only, one just preceeding the passage cited above by us. The passage quoted by Vallabha is एतं संयद्वाम इत्याचक्षत एतं हि सर्वाणि वामान्यभिसंयन्ति सर्वाण्येनं वामान्यभिसंयन्ति य एवं वेद। एष उ वामनीरेष हि सर्वाणि वामानि नयति सर्वाणि वामानि नयति य एवं वेद। एष उ एव भामनीरेष हि सर्वेषु लोकेषु भाति सर्वेषु लोकेषु भाति य एवं वेद। (C.U. 4-15-4)

This they call संयद्वाम for all desirable things go towards him. All desirable things go to him who knows this. He is also Vāmānī for he brings all desirable things. He is also bhāmanī for he shines in all words. He who knows this shines in all worlds.

This passage cited by Vallabha is not substantially different from the one suggested by us. However, the passage suggested by Vallabha does not explain *ādi* in the sūtra. On the other hand, the passage cited by us accounts for the word ādi in the sūtra.

The third sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is सुखविशिष्टाभिधानादेव च। (1-2-15) And on account of the passage referring to that which is distinguished by pleasure (i.e. Brahman) The same section of the C.U. so far considered contains the v.v. of this sūtra too, and this sūtra removes any doubt, if it has persisted yet about the C.U. passages being considered as the v.v.s. The passage is प्राणो ब्रह्म। कं ब्रह्म। खं ब्रह्मेति। कं in the passage is taken to mean सुख pleasure, and that the sūtrakāra intends this passage as the v.v. becomes explicit where he actually employs the word क or गति. The sūtrakāra is not altogether so incomprehensible as so often he is made out to be. Of course, he has got his own system of composing the sūtras and we have to comprehend and unravel that system. Here in the sūtra 16 also, we have to differ from some of those commentators who consider the P.U. 1-10 as the v.v. Śaṅkara cites this passage from the P.U.

अथोत्तरेण तपसा ब्रह्मचर्येण श्रद्धया विद्ययात्मानमन्विष्यादित्यमभिजयन्ते। एतद्वै प्राणानामायतनमेतदमृतमभयमेतत्परायणमेतस्मान्न पुनरावर्तन्ते। (P.U. 1-10)

But those who seek for the self by austerity, chastity, faith and knowledge, they, by northern route, gain the sun. That, verily, is the support of lifebreaths. That is eternal, the fearless. That is the final goal. From that they do not return.

This is the v.v. of the sūtra श्रुतोपनिषत्कगत्यभिधानाच्च। (1-2-16) Also, on account of the mention of the path of him who has heard the Upaniṣads.

Our simple argument against this stand is that why should Bādarāyaṇa go out of the C.U. which can very well provide a passage for this sūtra also. This passage could be the very same which we have already referred to in the sūtra 1-2-14. And Rāmānuja and Valiabha do refer to this very passage in this sūtra. Rāmānuja writes

श्रुतोपनिषत्कस्य– अधिगतपरमपुरुषयाथात्म्यस्यानुसन्धेयतया श्रुत्यन्तरप्रतिपाद्यमाना अर्चिरादिकागतिर्या, तामपुनरावृत्तिलक्षणपरमपुरुषप्राप्तिकरीमुपकोसलायाक्षिपुरुषं श्रुतवते तेऽर्चिषिमेवाभिसम्भवन्त्यर्चषोऽहरह्न आपूर्यमाणपक्षम् इत्यारभ्य क्वचन्द्रमसो विद्युतं तत्पुरुषो मानवस्स एनान्ब्रह्म गमयत्येष देवपथो ब्रह्मपथ एतेन प्रतिपद्यमाना इतं मानवमावर्तं नावर्तन्तेह्न इत्यनेनोपदिशन्ति।

It is clear from this that, Rāmānuja refers to the very passage from the C.U. already alluded to by us. The same is the case with Vallabha.

The last sūtra is अनवस्थितेरसंभवाच्च नेतरः॥ (1-2-17)

(The person in the eye is) no other (than the Highest self) because of the instability (of others) and on account of the impossibility. The v.v. of the sūtra is the same passage with which the discussion of the adhikaraṇa was initiated i.e. य एषोऽक्षिणि पुरुषो दृश्यते एतदात्मेति होवाच एतदमृतमेतदभयमेतद्ब्रह्मेति।

The attributes of अमृतम् and अभयम् are not possible in an individual soul which is non-permanent.

It is interesting to note Madhva's way of interpreting the sūtra श्रुतोपनिषत्कगत्यभिधानाच्च। (1-2-16) Madhva disconnects क from उपनिषत् and connects it with गति. Then क गति would mean ब्रह्मगति as B.N.K. Sharma would explain. There is a decided advantage in connecting the word क in the sūtra (1-2-16) with 'gati' and interpreting the kagati as the attainment of the Supreme Brahman

by one who has understood the true nature of the person in the eye.'[1] This way of interpreting the sūtra is ingenious, but farfetched.

Antaryāmyadhikaraṇam (1-2-18 to 20)

and

Adṛśyatvādhikaraṇam (1-2-21 to 23)

Both these adhikaraṇas need not detain us any longer as both the adhikaraṇas have clearcut v.v.s.

Antaryāmyadhikaraṇa has three sūtras viz.

(i) अन्तर्याम्यधि दैवादिषु तद्धर्मव्यपदेशात्। (1-2-18)

(ii) न च स्मार्तमतद्धर्माभिलाषात्। (1-2-19)

and

(iii) शारीरश्चोभयेऽपि हि भेदेनैनमधीयते। (1-2-20)

and the v.v. of topic of discussion is अन्तर्यामिन् inner controller referred to in the passage from the B.U. (3-7-3)

यः पृथिव्यां तिष्ठन्पृथिव्या अन्तरो यं पृथिवी न वेद यस्य पृथिवी शरीरं यः पृथिवीमन्तरो यमयत्येष त आत्मान्तर्याम्यमृतः। He who dwells in the earth, yet within the earth, whom the earth does not know, whose body the earth is, who controls the earth, from within he is your self, the inner controller, the immortal. The word अन्तर्यामिन् has been incorporated in the body of the sūtra.

The second sūtra argues that the Indwelling spirit is not that which is assumed by the smṛti i.e. the Sāṁkhya system on account of the mention of characteristics not belonging to it. न च स्मार्तमतद्धर्माभिलापात्। (1-2-19). The sūtra has the passage from the same Upaniṣad enumerating those characteristics which cannot belong to the Pradhāna अदृष्टो द्रष्टाऽश्रुतः श्रोताऽमतो मन्ताऽविज्ञातो विज्ञाता। (B.U. 3-7-23)

The third sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is शारीरश्चोभयेऽपि हि भेदेनैनमधीयते। (1-2-20) The embodied soul (is not the Indwelling spirit) for in both the Śākhās it is taught differently. Kāṇva branch reads यो विज्ञाने तिष्ठन् and Mādhyandins read य आत्मनि तिष्ठन्. Both refer to the individual soul विज्ञान and आत्मन् and declare it to be different from the Indwelling spirit.

---

1. Sharma B.N.K. The Brahmasūtras and their Principal Commentaries Vol. 1 p.169.

Adṛśyatvādhikaraṇa (1-2-21 to 23)

also offers v.v., as if, on a platter, referring to the M.U. passage referring to the qualities of invisibility and others possessed by Brahman. अदृश्यत्वादिगुणको धर्मोक्तेः। (1-2-21) The M.U. passage is यत्तदद्रेश्यमग्राह्यमगोत्रमवर्णमचक्षुःश्रोत्रं तदपाणिपादं नित्यं

विभुः सर्वगतं सुसूक्ष्मं तदव्ययं यद्भूतयोनिं परिपश्यन्ति धीराः। (M.U. 1-1-6)

That which is unperceivable, ungraspable, without family, without caste, without sight or hearing, without hands or feet, eternal, all-pervading, omnipresent, exceedingly subtle that is the Undecaying which the wise perceive as the source of beings.

A passage, running closely parallel to this passage from the T.U. (2-7-1)

यदा ह्येवैष एतस्मिन्नदृश्येऽनात्म्येऽनिरुक्तेऽनिलयनेऽभयं प्रतिष्ठां विन्दते cannot be the v.v. of this adhikaraṇa as, it does not meet the qualification laid down in the next sūtra विशेषणभेदव्यपदेशाभ्यां च नेतरौ (1-2-22) The two other (the individual soul and the pradhāna) are not the source of all beings on account of the mention of distinctive epithets.

So the discussion of the M.U. passage should continue. The passage would be

दिव्यो ह्यमूर्तः पुरुषः सबाह्याभ्यन्तरो ह्यजः।

अप्राणो ह्यमनाः शुभ्रो ह्यक्षरात्परतः परः।। (M.U. 2-1-2)

Divine and formless is the person. He is without and within, unborn, without breath and without mind, pure and higher than the highest immutable.

The third sūtra is रूपोपन्यासाच्च (1-2-23) And also on account of the description of his form. The consideration of the M.U. passages is further continued. The sūtra has in view either of the following passages

अग्निर्मूर्धा चक्षुषी चन्द्रसूर्यौ दिशः श्रोत्रे वाग्विवृताश्च वेदाः।

वायुः प्राणो हृदयं विश्वमस्य पद्भ्यां पृथिवी ह्येष सर्वभूतान्तरात्मा।।

(M.U. 2-1-4)

Fire is His head, His eyes are the sun and the moon, the regions of the space are His ears, His speech the revealed Vedas, air is His life and His heart the world, out of his feet the earth (is born), indeed he is the self of all beings

and

यदा पश्यः पश्यते रुक्मवर्णं कर्तारमीशं पुरुषं ब्रह्मयोनिम्।
तथा विद्वान्पुण्यपापे विधूय निरञ्जनः परमं साम्यमुपैति।। (M.U. 3-1-3)

When a seer sees the creator of golden hue, the lord, the person, the source of Brahma, then being a knower, shaking off good and evil, and free from stain, he attains supreme equality with the Lord.

Vaiśvānarādhikaraṇam (1-2-24 to 32)

The last adhikaraṇa of this pāda has the following nine sūtras:

(i) वैश्वानरः साधारणशब्दविशेषात्। (1-2-24)

(ii) स्मर्यमाणमनुमानं स्यादिति। (1-2-25) (iii) शब्दादिभ्योऽन्तः प्रतिष्ठानाच्च नेति चेन्न तथादृष्ट्युपदेशादसंभवात्पुरुषमपि चैनमधीयते। (1-2-26)

(iv) अत एव न देवता भूतं च। (1-2-27)

(v) साक्षादप्यविरोधं जैमिनिः। (1-2-28)

(vi) अभिव्यक्तेरित्याश्मरथ्यः। (1-2-29)

(vii) अनुस्मृतेर्बादरिः। (1-2-30)

(viii) संपत्तेरिति जैमिनिस्तथा हि दर्शयति। (1-2-31)

(ix) आमनन्ति चैनमस्मिन्। (1-2-32)

It is patent, that this adhikaraṇa discusses the Vaiśvānara vidyā of the C.U. 5-11-24 which begins with the inquiry को न आत्मा किं ब्रह्म? Those who were desirous of knowing Brahman went to Aśvapati Kaikeya who was studying the Universal self (Vaiśvānara) then. Aśvapati taught them this Vaiśvānara vidyā.

The first sūtra is वैश्वानरः साधारणशब्दविशेषात्। (1-2-24) Vaiśvānara is the (Highest self) on account of the distinction (qualifying) common words. The sūtra and the adhikaraṇa as a whole has the abovereferred to passage in view. The question is whether the word Vaiśvānara could refer to the fire in the body, or the element fire or the deity fire. The context of the passage rules out these possibilities. Further, does the word mean individual soul or the Highest self? The sūtra says that though the words Vaiśvānara and the self have various meanings, the terms refer to the Highest Self, Vaiśvānara is the self of the worlds and is described as having head, eyes, etc. for the purposes of meditation. The relevant passage from the C.U. is

यस्त्वेतमेवं प्रादेशमात्रमभिविमानमात्मानं वैश्वानरमुपास्ते स सर्वेषु लोकेषु भूतेषु सर्वेष्वात्मस्वन्नमत्ति तस्य ह वा एतस्यात्मनो वैश्वानरस्य मूर्धैव सुतेजाश्चक्षुर्विश्वरूपः प्राणः

पृथग्वर्त्मात्मा सदेहो बहुलो बस्तिरेव रयिः पृथिव्येव पादावुर एव वेदिर्लोमानि बर्हिर्हृदयं गार्हपत्यो मनोऽन्वाहार्यपचन आस्यमाहवनीयः। (C.U. 5-18-1,2)

He, however, who meditates on the Universal self as of the measure of a span, or as identical with the self, eats food in all worlds, in all beings, in all selves of this Universal Self, the head indeed is the good light, the eye is the universal form, breath is of varied courses, the body is the full , the bladder is wealth, the feet are the earth, the chest indeed is the sacrificial area, the hair is the sacred grass, the heart is the gārhaptya fire, the mind is the anvāhāryapacana fire and the mouth is the āhavanīya fire.

The way in which Vaiśvānara is described in the above quoted passage, indicates that it can only mean the Universal Self.

The second sūtra स्मर्यमाणमनुमानं स्यादिति। (1-2-25) Because that which is stated in the Smṛti should be an inference. This sūtra has in view the Smṛti passage from the B.G. अहं वैश्वानरो भूत्वा प्राणिनां देहमाश्रितः। (XV.14) wherein, the Vaiśvānara, the fire is identified with the Supreme Brahman. It may be noted that except Madhva and Baladeva, no commentator has mentioned this, so obvious a passage from the B.G. as the v.v. Śaṅkara quotes a passage from the V.P.

यस्याग्निरास्यं द्यौर्मूर्धा खं नाभिश्चरणौ क्षितिः।
सूर्यश्चक्षुर्दिशः श्रोत्रं तस्मै लोकात्मने नमः॥

He of whom Agni is the mouth, heaven the head, sky the navel, feet the earth, the sun the eyes, quarters the ears, bow to Him, the self of the Universe.

B.N.K. Sharma explains this phenomenon as follows. Instead of taking their (Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja) stand on this clearly worded text, establishing the identity of Brahman with Vaiśvānara, (they) have sought to explain the sūtra in a round about way quoting a different verse from a different source, the Viṣṇu Purāṇa. There is a reasoning behind Śaṅkara's preference for Viṣṇupurāṇa text to the B.G. text. Śaṅkara writes, तत्स्मर्यमाणं रूपं मूलभूतां श्रुतिमनुमा पयदस्य वैश्वानरशब्दस्य परमेश्वरपरत्वेऽनुमानं किऽगं गमकं स्यादित्यर्थः।

Śaṅkara's explanation of this sūtra is that from the shape of Brahman described in this Viṣṇupurāṇa passage, which is a smṛti, we infer the existence of a śruti text from which this smṛti is derived and this in its turn, helps us to conclude that such a śruti

text is verily the one from the C.U. mentioned in the opening sūtra'.[1] Further B.N.K. Sharma rebutting the argument of Śaṅkara further states, 'The presence of a smṛti text like the one cited from the Viṣṇupurāṇa which speaks of the attributes of the Lokātman, would of course, point to the existence of a probable śruti text of corresponding sense, as its source, on the basis of the Pūrvamīmāṁsā dictum Asti hyanumānam. But such a source could as well be found in the M.U. text (2-1-4).

अग्निर्मूर्धा चक्षुषी चन्द्रसूर्यो दिश: श्रोत्रे वाग्विवृताश्च वेदा:।
वायु: प्राणो हृदयं विश्वमस्य पद्भ्यां पृथिवी ह्येष सर्वान्तरात्मा॥

in which there is no mention of Vaiśvānara.

The Mīmāṁsā dictum on which Śaṅkara and his commentators rely can only help us to establish that there must be an original śruti source corresponding to the sense of the given smṛti passage. In the present instance it would not necessarily prove that smṛti text must also be and connected with the Vaiśvānara vidyā. To achieve this result, it would be more proper to choose a more decisive passage mentioning the Vaiśvānara such as the one from the B.G. as the text capable of leading to the inference that in the śruti text also the Vaiśvānara spoken of is Brahman'[2]

The third sūtra is शब्दादिभ्योऽन्त: प्रतिष्ठानाच्च नेति चेन्न तथादृष्ट्युपदेशादसंभवात्पुरुषमपि चैनमधीयते। (1-2-26)

If it be said that, (Vaiśvānara is the fire in the body and) not (the Highest Self) on account of the words etc. and on account of his abiding within (which is the characteristic of the fire residing in the body), (we say), not so, because of the teaching of the vision (of the Lord) thus, on account of impossibility and because also, they speak of him as the person.

This long winded sūtra presents certain agruments based upon the scriptural passages. The first part of the sūtra presents the pūrvapakṣa i.e. स एषोऽग्निर्वैश्वानर:। Vaiśvānara means either the physical fire as stated here, or the digestive fire abiding within as stated further in passage पुरुषोऽन्त: प्रतिष्ठितम्, (C.U. 3-14-2). In the C.U. passage under discussion, the Vaiśvānara is said to possess

1. Sharma B.N.K. The Brahmasūtras and their Principal Commentaries Vol. 1 p.196
2. Ibid p.196

the head etc. which is not possible in the case of the fire. The Vaiśvānara, not only in the C.U. passage referred to here, but elsewhere too, is often identified with the person as in the passage of the S.B. स एषोऽग्निर्वैश्वानरो (S.B. 10-6-11).

The fourth sūtra अत एव न देवता भूतं च।

For the same reason, the Vaiśvānara is neither the deity (of fire) nor the element of fire. This sūtra as a sort of conclusion of the preceeding discussion in the sūtras of this adhikaraṇa and hence, no particular v.v, is suggested.

The following four sūtras साक्षादप्यविरोधं जैमिनिः, अभिव्यक्तेराश्मरथ्यः, अनुस्मृतेर्बादरिः, संपत्तेरितिजैमिनिस्तथा हि दर्शयति present the view points of the three ācāryas regarding the vaiśvānara.

The opinion of Jaimini is expressed in the sūtra साक्षादप्यविरोधं जैमिनिः। (1-2-28). Jaimini holds that even if the Highest self is taken as the object of worship as Vaiśvānara directly, there does not arise any contradiction.

Jaimini holds that even if we worship Vaiśvānara, not as a symbol but as God himself, there is no contradiction.

The opinion of Āśmarathya is expressed in this sūtra

अभिव्यक्तेरित्याश्मथ्यः। (1-2-29). On account of manifestation (so thinks) Āśmarathya. If the objection is raised that according to the scripture, the supreme is measured by a span, the sūtra answers that the Supreme though he transcends all measurements, manifests himself for the benefit of his devotees in limited forms. Rāmānuja takes अभिव्यक्ति to mean definiteness, for helping the concentration of devotees, the Lord assumes definite forms.

The opinion of Bādari is presented in this sūtra

अनुस्मृतेर्बादरिः (1-2-30) On account of remembrance (so opines) Badri.

The highest self is said to be measured by a span since he is remembered by means of the mind located in the heart which is of the measure of a span. Or the Highest Self, though not really measured by a span is to be remembered as being of the measure of a span.

The next sūtra expresses the view of Jaimini सम्पत्तेरिति जैमिनिः तथा हि दर्शयति (2-31). According to Jaimini (God is said to be a span in length) on account of imaginative identification, for as the

(scripture) shows. The supreme Self is imagined to be span-long, for the purpose of meditation. The passage from the C.U. under discussion shows the God to be so.

The last sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is आमनन्ति चैनमस्मिन्। (1-2-32). Moreover the śrutis speak of the Highest Self as being in that.

The sūtra is again an instance of terseness and hence, it is a bit difficult to point out the exact v.v., that the sūtrakāra has in view. Śaṅkara takes the v.v. from the J.U.

य एषोऽनन्तोऽव्यक्त आत्मा सोऽविमुक्ते प्रतिष्ठित इति। सोऽविमुक्तः कस्मिन्प्रतिष्ठित इति। वरणायां नास्यां च मध्ये प्रतिष्ठित इति। का वै वरणा का च नासीति।... कतमच्चास्य स्थानं भवतीति। भ्रूवोर्घ्राणस्य च यः संधिः स एष द्युलोकस्य परस्य संधिर्भवतीति। (J.U. 1)

'The self which is infinite and unmanifested is established in avimukta. In what is avimukta established? It is established in the middle of Varaṇā and Nāsi. What is their abode? It is the meeting-place of the eyebrows and the nose. It is the meeting place of the world of gods and beyond.

Rāmānuja, however, points out a passage from the C.U. only. तस्य ह वा एतस्यात्मनो वैश्वानरस्य मूर्धैव सुतेजाः।

This stand of Rāmānuja accords well with our position that, context of a particular passage from an Upaniṣad taken up for consideration for adhikaraṇa should be retained and v.v.s for the individual sūtras should be located in that very Upaniṣad. Here C.U. passage is under consideration and so, the v.v. of this particular sūtra should be located from the C.U. only.

It may be mentioned that Belvalkar has favoured the v.v. pointed out by Rāmānuja in connection with his theory of C.U. Brahmasūtra. He states favouring the omission of other sūtras in this adhikaraṇa, 'And in chapter I, Pada II, adhikaraṇa 7 (sūtras 24-32) we should omit sūtras 25 and 26, make the reference in sūtra 32 – with Rāmānuja to Chā. V. 18-12 rather than with Śaṅkara to Jābāla Upaniṣad and omitting the sūtras 29 and 30 which refer to the views of Āśmarathya and Bādari, weld together sūtras 28 and 31 into one continuous sūtra to be thus worded साक्षादप्यविरोधः सम्पत्तेस्तथा हि दर्शयति।[1]

---

1. Belvalkar S.K., Shree Gopal Basu Mallik Lectures on Vedānta Philosophy pp. 143-44

CHAPTER - 5

THE VIṢAYAVĀKYAS IN THE THIRD AND FOURTH PĀDAS OF THE SAMANVAYĀDHYĀYA

Viṣayavākyas of the 1-3-1 to 43.

Dyubhvādhyadhikaraṇam (1-3-1). The first adhikaraṇa of the third pāda has the following 7 sūtras viz.

(i) द्युभ्वाद्यायतनं स्वशब्दात्। (1-3-1)

(ii) मुक्तोपसृप्यव्यपदेशात्। (1-3-2)

(iii) नानुमानमतच्छशब्दात्। (1-3-3)

(iv) प्राणभृच्च। (1-3-4)

(v) भेदव्यपदेशात्। (1-3-5)

(vi) प्रकरणात्। (1-3-6)

(vii) स्थित्यदनाभ्याम् च (1-3-7)

The first sūtra is द्युभ्वाद्यायतनं स्वशब्दात्। (1-3-1-) The support of the heaven, the earth and the rest (is Brahman) because of the word 'own'. The v.v. of the first sūtra is the passage from the M.U.

यस्मिन्द्यौः पृथिवी चान्तरिक्षमोतं मनः सह प्राणैश्च सर्वैः।

तमेवैकं जानथ आत्मानमन्या वाचो विमुञ्चथामृतस्यैष सेतुः ।। (M.U. 2-2-5)

He in whom the sky, the earth, and the space are woven as also the mind along with all the vital breaths, know him alone as the one self. Shun other utterances. This is the bridge to immortality.

This passage forms the v.v. of the sūtra beyond any doubt not only because it has been agreed upon by all the commentators, but also, the characteristic proclivity of the sūtrakāra to incorporate hints in the body of the sūtra is also discernible here. The word द्यु from the passage is straightaway mentioned in the sūtra. Then the भू in the sūtra is a synonym of पृथिवी of the passage and the word आदि in the sūtra refers to the remaining things viz. अन्तरिक्षम्, मनः, प्राणः in the passage. Similarly स्व points to आत्मन् in the Upaniṣad. This is most remarkable and hence, the passage from the M.U. is the v.v. intended by the sūtrakāra.

The second sūtra is मुक्तोपसृप्यव्यपदेशात्। (1-3-2). Because it is mentioned as that which is to be attained by the released. Commentators have mentioned different passages albeit, from the M.U. only as the v.v.s of the sūtra.

Śaṅkara mentions the following passages from the M.U,

भिद्यते हृदयग्रन्थिश्छिद्यन्ते सर्वसंशयाः।

क्षीयन्ते चास्य कर्माणि तस्मिन्दृष्टे परावरे।। (M.U. 2-2-9)

The knot of the heart is cut asunder, all doubts are destroyed, his deeds decay when He is seen the higher and the lower.

Also the following is mentioned by Śaṅkara

तथा विद्वान्नामरूपाद्विमुक्तः परात्परं पुरुषमुपैति दिव्यम्। (M.U. 3-2-8).

Similarly the knower, freed from name and shape attaining to the divine person, higher than the high.

Rāmānuja mentions along with 3-2-8 also

यदा पश्यः पश्यते रुक्मवर्णं कर्तारमीशं पुरुषं ब्रह्मयोनिम्।

तथा विद्वान् पुण्यपापे विधूय निरञ्जनः परमं साम्यमुपैति।। (M.U. 3-1-3)

When a seer sees the creator of golden hue, the Lord, the person, the source of Brahma, then being a knower, shaking off merit and demerit and free from stain, he attains supreme quality with the Lord.[1]

Looking at the context of the verses, any of these passages can be a v.v. But if one has to choose the closest to the sūtra then possibly the verse is 3-2-8

यथा नद्यः स्यन्दमानाः समुद्रेऽस्तं गच्छन्ति नामरूपे विहाय।

तथा विद्वान्नामरूपाद्विमुक्तः परात्परं पुरुषमुपैति दिव्यम्।।

Just as the flowing rivers disappear in the ocean casting off name and form, even so the knower, freed from name and shape attains to the divine person, higher than the high.

This verse can be the v.v. of the sūtra, as there is मुक्तः in the sūtra corresponding to विमुक्तः in the passage, and also the sūtra mentions 'approaching' which is उपैति in the sūtra. Moreover the

---

1. Vijñānabhikṣu mentions

गताः कलाः पञ्चदशप्रतिष्ठा देवाश्च सर्वे प्रतिदेवतासु।

कर्माणि विज्ञानमयश्च आत्मा परेऽव्यये सर्व एकीभवन्ति।। (M.U. 3-2-7)

dṛṣṭānta or the analogy in the passage is in consonance with the wording of the sūtra.

The third sūtra is नानुमानमतच्छब्दात्। (1-3-3). Not that which is inferred on account of there being no text to indicate it.[1]

Anumāna stands for the pradhāna because it is established by inference. There is no mention of the pradhāna in the passage under consideration. The passage, on the contrary, refers to Brahman यः सर्वज्ञः सर्ववित् (M.U. 1-1-9) who is omniscient, all knowing.

The fourth sūtra is प्राणभृच्च। (1-3-4). (Not) the bearer of the vital breaths too. This sūtra is in continuation of the third sūtra. Neither the pradhāna nor the individual soul- bearer of the vital breaths is referred to in the passage.

No particular v.v. is referred to by the commentators save Vallabha who mentions मनोमयः प्राणशरीरनेता (M.U. 2-2-7)

Not only that प्राणभृत् individual soul is not mentioned in the passages from the M.U., but there are passages which imply exclusion of it i.e. jīva. More specific than the passage referred to by Vallabha is

दिव्यो ह्यमूर्तः पुरुषः सबाह्याभ्यन्तरो ह्यजः।
अप्राणो ह्यमनाः शुभ्रो ह्यक्षरात्परतः परः।। (M.U. 2-1-2)

Divine and formless is the person. He is without and within, unborn, without breath, without mind, pure and higher than the highest immutable.

Further

एतस्माज्जायते प्राणो मनः सर्वेन्द्रियाणि च।
खं वायुर्ज्योतिरापः पृथिवी विश्वस्य धारिणी। (M.U. 2-1-3)
अग्निर्मूर्धा चक्षुषी चन्द्रसूर्यौ दिशः श्रोत्रे वाग्विवृताश्च वेदाः।
वायुः प्राणो हृदयं विश्वमस्य पद्भ्यां पृथिवी ह्येष सर्वभूतान्तरात्मा।। (M.U. 2-1-4)

From him are born life, mind, all the senseorgans, ether, air, light, water and earth, the supporter of all.

Fire is His head, His eyes are the sun and the moon, the regions of space are His ears, His speech the revealed Vedas, air is His life, and His heart the world. Out of His feet, the earth is born, indeed He is the self of all beings.

---

1. See infra, the relevant discussion on the sūtras 1-1-5 to 11

The fifth sūtra is भेदव्यपदेशात्। (1-3-5) On account of the mention of difference. This sūtra further corroborates the line of argument adopted in the third and the fourth sūtras. The commentators have referred to तमेवैकं जानथ आत्मानम् (M.U. 2-2-5) know him alone as the one self. One may feel that this portion, though implying that जीवज्ञाता and Brahman -ज्ञेय are different, does not exactly bring out the difference between the individual soul and the highest soul. That is perhaps done by the following line.

जुष्टं यदा पश्यत्यन्यमीशमस्य महिमानमिति वीतशोकः। (M.U. 3-1-2)

When he sees the other, the Lord who is worshipped and his greatness, he becomes freed from sorrow.

The sixth sūtra is प्रकरणात्। (1-3-6), On account of the context. The sūtra refers to the context of the M.U. The M.U. starts with a query कस्मिन्नु भगवो विज्ञाते सर्वमिदं विज्ञातं भवति। (M.U. 1-1-3). Through what being known, Revered Sir, does all this become known. And the whole of the Upaniṣad is an answer to that query.

The seventh and the last sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is स्थित्यदनाभ्यां च। (1-3-7). And on account of the two characteristics viz, abiding and eating, This sūtra unmistakably refers to the passage dealing with the difference between the individual soul and the highest soul.

द्वा सुपर्णा सयुजा सखाया समानं वृक्षं परिषस्वजाते।
तयोरन्यः पिप्पलं स्वाद्वत्त्यनश्नन्नन्यो अभिचाकशीति।। (M.U. 3-1-1)

Two birds, fine-winged companions, always united, cling to the self same tree. Of these two, the one eats the sweet fruit and the other looks without eating.

The argument regarding the difference between the individual soul and the highest soul which began from the fifth sūtra is completed here in the last sūtra of the adhikaraṇa.[1]

The whole adhikaraṇa has been devoted to the consideration of the passages from the M.U. and supports our method of locating the v.v.s for the individual sūtras from the same source which has been a topic of discussion for the adhikaraṇa.

---

1. George C. Adams, Jr., Bādarāyaṇa's Brahmasūtras, Pub. Motilal Banarasi dass, Delhi, 1993, p. 92

Bhūmādhikaraṇam (1-3-8, 9)

This adhikarna comprises two sūtras viz. (i) भूमा संप्रसादादध्युपदेशात्। (1-3-8), (ii) धर्मोपपत्तेश्च। (1-3-9)

This adhikaraṇa and the individual sūtras do not warrant any discussion regarding the v.v. as there is a word in the sūtra (1-3-8) itself. Which points out to a passage taken up for discussion in the adhikaraṇa. The भूमन् or भूमा is the word which occurs in the C.U. 7-23, 24 i.e.

यो वै भूमा तत्सुखं नाल्पे सुखमस्ति भूमैव सुखं भूमा त्वेव विजिज्ञासितव्य इति भूमानं भगवो विजिज्ञास इति। यत्र नान्यत्पश्यति नान्यच्छृणोति नान्यद्विजानाति स भूमाथ यत्रान्यत्पश्यत्यन्यच्छृणोत्यन्यद्विजानाति तदल्पं यो वै भूमा तदमृतमथ यदल्पं तन्मर्त्यम्।

The infinite is happiness. There is no happiness in anything small. Only the infinite is happiness. But one must desire to understand the infinite. Venerable Sir, I desire to understand the infinite where one sees nothing else, hears nothing else, understands nothing else, that is the infinite.

But where one sees something else, hears something else, understands something else, that is the small. Indeed the infinite is the same as the immortal, the finite is the same as the mortal.

Akṣarādhikaraṇam (1-3-10 to 12)

This adhikaraṇa is also similar to the preceeding adhikaraṇa as far as v.v. is concerned. The adhikaraṇa consists of the following three sūtras viz.

(i) अक्षरमम्बरान्तधृतेः। (1-3-10)

(ii) सा च प्रशासनात्। (1-3-11) (iii) अन्यभावव्यावृत्तेश्च। (1-3-12)

The first sūtra is अक्षरमम्बरान्तधृतेः। (1-3-10) The Imperishable is Brahman on account of its supporting call things upto space. The passage from the B.U. is under consideration, in the adhikaraṇa. कस्मिन्नु खल्वाकाश ओतश्च प्रोतश्चेति। स होवाच। एतदवै तदक्षरं गार्गि ब्राह्मणा अभिवदन्त्यस्थूलमनण्वह्रस्वमदीर्घं... (B.U. 3-8-7, 8) Does akṣara refer to the syllable or to the Highest self? The sūtra answers that it is the Highest self, support of everything upto space, while all things find their support in ākāśa, ākāśa itself is supported by akṣara. It can only be Brahman. Akṣara is that which is not perishable, which is allpervading and so on can signify Brahman only.

The sūtra is typical of the style of the sūtrakāra. The wording of the sūtra and the context of the B.U. passage leave no room for

doubt regarding the v.v. of the sūtra, as we have the word अक्षरम् the identity of which with Brahman is to be decided in the B.U. passage. अक्षरम् is directly lifted from the passage of the B.U. अक्षरम् is substituted for आकाश as is the sūtrakāra's wont. The topic of the Imperishable one is introduced in reply to a query कस्मिन्नु खल्वाकाश ओतश्च प्रोतश्चेति। Thus the context of the passage and the wording of the sūtra mark the passage as one of the surest v.v.s of the Brahmasūtra.

The second sūtra is सा च प्रशासनात्। (1-3-11) And this supporting (vidhṛti) belongs to the Highest Lord only on account of his ruling over them. This sūtra refers to the passage immediately following the abovequoted passage. Moreover, the passage has the word प्रशासन which has been incorporated in the sūtra. The passage is एतस्य वा अक्षरस्य प्रशासने गार्गि सूर्याचन्द्रमसौ विधृतौ तिष्ठत एतस्य वा अक्षरस्य प्रशासने गार्गि द्यावापृथिव्यौ विधृते तिष्ठत:

...and so on, (B.U. 3-8-9) In this passage the word प्रशासन is employed five times, and सा in the sūtra obviously is a pronoun standing for धृति: in the previous sūtra.

The last sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is (1-3-12) And on account of the exclusion of other things. Other alternatives than the Imperishable are excluded.

The Imperishable is further described in such a manner that it excludes any other entity. This has been done in the following passage from the B.U.

तद्वा एतदक्षरं गार्ग्यदृष्टं द्रष्टश्रुतं श्रोत्रमतं मन्त्रविज्ञातं विज्ञातृ नान्यदतोऽस्ति द्रष्टृनान्यदतोऽस्ति श्रोतृ नान्यदतोऽस्ति मन्तृ नान्यदतोऽस्ति विज्ञात्रेतस्मिन्नु खल्वक्षरे गार्ग्याकाश ओतश्च प्रोतश्चेति। (B.U. 3-8-11) Verily, that Imperishable, O Gārgi, is unseen, but is the seer, is unheard, but is the hearer, unthought but is the thinker, unknown but is the knower. There is no other seer but this, there is no other hearer but this, there is no other thinker, but this, there is no other knower but this. By this Imperishable O Gārgi, is space woven like warp and woof.

The Imperishable is said to be seeing, hearing and perceiving which Pradhāna or any other entity is not capable of. Moreover, there is none beside the Imperishable to see, hear, or perceive. Hence, the individual soul too stand excluded. Moreover, this Akṣara sees etc. without being seen etc. So it could be Brahman alone.

Īkṣatikarmavyapadeśādhikaraṇam (1-3-13)

This adhikaraṇa consists of just one sūtra ईक्षतिकर्मव्यपदेशात्सः। (1-3-13) On account of mention as the object of seeing, He is the Highest Self.

The sūtra must have a different passage from that of the C.U. passage already considered in the Īkṣatyādhikaraṇam (1-1-5 to 11) As we have seen there the passages from Kena (1-4), Kaṭha (4-1), Maitri (7-1) and Nṛ (6) do not remain in the field because either they have a contextual localised significance only arising out of some story or they do not refer to the Highest Reality. B.U. passages are स ऐक्षत यदि वा इममभिमंस्ये कनीयोऽन्नं करिष्य इति स तया वाचा तेनात्मनेदं सर्वमसृजत यदिदं किंचर्चो यजूंषि सामानि छन्दांसि यज्ञाप्रन्प्रजाः पशून् (B.U. 1-2-5) He thought, 'If I kill him, I shall make very little food. With that speech, with that self he brought forth all this whatever exists here, the Ṛgveda, the Yajurveda, and the Sāmaveda, the metres, the sacrifices, men and cattle. And सोऽबिभेत्तस्मादेकाकी बिभेति स हायमीक्षांचक्रे यन्मदन्यन्नास्ति कस्मान्नु बिभेमीति तत् एवास्य भयं वीयाय कस्माच्च भेष्यद् द्वितीयाद्वै भयं भवति। (B.U. 1-4-2) He was afraid. Therefore, one who is alone is afraid. This one then thought to himself, Since there is nothing else then myself of what I am afraid? Thereupon his fear, indeed vanished, for of what should he have been afraid? Surely it is from a second that fear arises.

These passages deal with the process of creation which is here out of question. The same is the case with the A.U. स ईक्षत लोकान्नु सृजा इति (1-1) Let me now create the worlds.

The celebrated C.U. passage alluded to above is also out of consideration.

So at first, we feel like agreeing with George C. Adams, Jr. who says regarding this sūtra, 'Here we find an unusual situation where a topical section consists of only one aphorism, the meaning of which is somewhat unclear.' But, if we take into account the wording of the sūtra which mentions a कर्म object of ईक्षति, then, we may have to agree with Śaṅkara who takes a passage from the P.U. as a v.v. and other commentators follow him except Madhva.

The passage is यः पुनरेतं त्रिमात्रेणोमित्येतेनैवाक्षरेण परं पुरुषमभिध्यायीत स तेजसि सूर्ये सम्पन्नः। यथा पादोदरस्त्वचा विनिर्मुच्यत एवं ह वै स पाप्मना विनिर्मुक्तः स सामभिरुन्नीयते ब्रह्मलोकं स एतस्माज्जीवघनात्परात्परं पुरिशयं पुरुषमीक्षते। (P.U. 5-

5) But if he meditates on the highest person with the three elements of the syllable Aum, he becomes one with the light, the sun. Even as a snake is freed from its skin, even so, is he freed from sins. He is led by sāman to the world of Brahma. He sees the person that dwells in the body, who is higher than the highest life.

If will be seen that in the last line the कर्म of ईक्षति is mentioned viz, the Highest Self. The object of meditation is not the jīva-ghana but that which transcends it, as the use of the words para and puruṣa indicate. So, what is meant to be stated is the Ultimate Entity should be mentioned as the object of the verb ईक्ष् as the v.v. of the sūtra. And such a passage is from the P.U.

Daharādhikaraṇam (1-3-14 to 21)

The Daharādhikaraṇam consists of the following 8 sūtras

(i) दहर उत्तरेभ्यः. (1-3-14)

(ii) गतिशब्दाभ्यां तथा हि दृष्टं लिङ्गं च। (1-3-15)

(iii) धृतेश्च महिम्नोऽस्यास्मिन्नुपलब्धेः। (1-3-16)

(iv) प्रसिद्धेश्च। (1-3-17)

(v) इतरपरामर्शात्स इति चेन्नासंभवात्। (1-3-19)

(vi) उत्तराच्चेदाविर्भूतस्वरूपस्तु। (1-3-19)

(vii) अन्यार्थश्च परामर्शः। (1-3-20)

(viii) अल्पश्रुतेरिति चेत्तदुक्तम्। (1-2-21)

Obviously दहर is the keyword which occurs only thrice in the Upaniṣadic literature. One such occurrence is in the Mahānārāyaṇa Upaniṣad and the other is in the Kṣurikā. The third is in the C.U. 8-1-1 which seems to be the topic of discussion of this adhikaraṇa. All the commentators too agree as far as this is concerned. The passage is अथ यदिदमस्मिन्ब्रह्मपुरे दहरं पुण्डरीकं वेश्म दहरोऽस्मिन्नन्तराकाशः। तस्मिन्यदन्तस्तदन्वेष्टव्यं तद्वाव विजिज्ञासितव्यम्। (C.U. 8-1-1)

Now here, in this city of Brahman is an abode, a small lotus flower, within it is a small space. What is within that should be sought, for that, indeed, is what one should desire to understand.

This is the v.v. of the first sūtra दहर उत्तरेभ्यः। (1-3-14) The small (space) is Brahman because of what follows (referring to the reasons given in remaining sūtras of the adhikaraṇa).

The doubt arises whether दहर in the passage refers to the element ākāśa or the individual soul or Brahman. Dahara does not refer to the element ākāśa, for the teacher asks us to search and understand that which is in the heart and it cannot be the element ākāśa. दहर cannot refer to the individual soul as it cannot be said to be all pervading like ākāśa. So दहर refers to the Highest Self and not to the individual soul or the element ākāśa.

That दहर refers to Brahman is made clear on the strength of what follows.

The second sūtra is गतिशब्दाभ्यां तथा हि दृष्टं लिङ्गं च। (The small is Brahman) on account of movement and of the word for thus it is seen (elsewhere) and there is reason for inference as well.

The sūtra refers to the passage coming close after the abovecited passage viz. एवमेवेमाः सर्वा प्रजा अहरहर्गच्छन्त्य एतं ब्रह्मलोकं न विन्दन्त्यनृतेन हि प्रत्यूढाः। (C.U. 8-3-2) In this way, all these creatures go day after day into the Brahmaworld and yet do not find it, for they are carried away by untruth. The word ब्रह्मलोक stands for the दहर and the सर्वाः प्रजा are individual souls. That all the individual souls go to the ब्रह्मलोक makes us infer that ब्रह्मलोक is दहर.

शब्द in the sūtra and in the Brahmasūtra, means the śruti. So दृष्टम् in the sūtra is to be taken as seen (in the śruti elsewhere). But it can also be taken as seen (in the world), as भामती specifies वेदे च लोके च दृष्टम्।

The third sūtra is धृतेश्च महिम्नोऽस्यास्मिन्नुपलब्धेः (1-3-16)

And because the greatness of lending support is found in him, (the Dahara is Brahman) The sūtra refers to the passage

अथ य आत्मा स सेतुर्विधृतिरेषां लोकानामसंभेदाय (C.U. 8-4-1) Now the self is the bridge, the boundary for keeping these worlds apart. Almost identical words are found in the B.U. एष सेतुर्विधरण एषां लोकानामसंभेदाय। (B.U. 4-4-22). And the passage from the C.U. under consideration gives us the exact v.v. So it is not necessary to go outside the C.U.

The greatness of dahara as indicated in the sūtra may be pointed out in the passage यावान्वाऽअयमाकाशस्तावानेषोऽन्तर्हृदय आकाश उभे अस्मिन्द्यावापृथिवी अन्तरेव समाहिते उभावग्निश्च वायुश्च सूर्याचन्द्रमसावुभौ विद्युन्नक्षत्राणि यच्चास्येहास्ति यच्च नास्ति सर्वं तदस्मिन्समाहितमिति। (C.U. 8-1-3) As far as this space extends, so far extends the space within the heart. Within it, indeed are contained both heaven and earth,

both fire and air, both sun and moon, lighting and the stars. Whatever there is of him in this world and whatever is not, all that is contained in it.

So obvious a passage has not been selected for the discussion to point out the 'greatness' by the commentators barring Vallabha who points out this very passage. Śaṅkara writes अयं च महिमा परमेश्वर एव श्रुत्यन्तरादुपलभ्यते— एतस्य वा अक्षरस्य प्रशासने गार्गि सूर्याचन्द्रमसौ विधृतौ तिष्ठतः। (B.U. 3-8-9)

Other commentators including Madhva follow Śaṅkara.

The fourth sūtra is प्रसिद्धेश्च। (1-3-17) And because it is wellknown. It is wellknown that dahara is the Highest Self. Now the sūtra is couched in the most general terms and hence it is difficult to point out the exact v.v. But instead of going very far in search of the v.v. as Śaṅkara seems to have done in pointing out आकाशो वै नामरूपयोर्निर्वहिता। (C.U. 8-14-1) Verily, what is called space is the determinant of name and form.

One may legitimately choose a passage which is nearer viz. अथ य एष सम्प्रसादोऽस्माच्छरीरात्समुत्थाय परं ज्योतिरुपसंपद्य स्वेन रूपेणाभिनिष्पद्यते एष आत्मेति होवाचेतदमृतमभयमेतब्रह्मेति तस्य ह वा एतस्य ब्रह्मणो नाम सत्यमिति। (C.U. 8-3-4)

Now that serene being, rising out of this body and reaching the highest light appears in his own form. He is the self, said he. That is the immortal, the fearless. That is Brahman. Verily, the name of that Brahman is the True.

Here it may be stated that, in the previous passage

एवमेवेमाः सर्वाः प्रजा अहरहर्गच्छन्त्य एतं ब्रह्मलोकं न विन्दत्यनृतेन हि प्रत्यूढाः। (C.U. 8-3-2) Dahara is identified with the Brahmaloka. Further dahara is identified with the आत्मा in स वा एष आत्मा हृदि (C.U. 8-3-3). Commenting upon it in the Upaniṣad, Śaṅkara writes स वै यः आत्माऽपहतपाप्मा इति प्रकृतः वै शब्देन तं स्मारयति। एष विवक्षित आत्मा हृदयपुण्डरीके आकाशशब्देनाभिहितः।

Thus the identification between दहर-ब्रह्म-आत्मा is brought about and hence, अथ य एष......is the v.v. of the sūtra.

Rāmānuja refers to the passages सर्वाणि ह वा इमानि भूतान्याकाशादेव समुत्पद्यन्ते। (C.U. 1-9-1) All these creatures are produced from space only. को ह्येवान्यात्कः प्राण्यात्। यदेष आकाश आनन्दो न स्यात्। (T.U. 2-7) For who, indeed could live, who breathe, if there were not bliss in space?

Vallabha refers to the portion in which an epithet अपहतपाप्मा occurs. He writes. अपहतपाप्मत्वादिप्रसिद्धिः। The relevant portion Vallabha means is this एष आत्मापहतपाप्मा विजरो विमृत्युर्विशोको विजिघत्सोऽपिपासः सत्यकामः सत्यसंकल्पो...। (C.U. 8-1-5). It is the self free from sin, free from old age, free from death, free from sorrow, free from hunger, free from thirst, whose desire is the real, whose thought is the real...

The fifth sūtra is इतरपरामर्शात्स इति चेन्नासंभवात् (1-3-18)

If it be said that on account of reference to the other (the individual soul), he is the (dahara), (we say) no, for it is impossible. Here obviously the passage for consideration is the one cited in the previous sūtra i.e.

य एष सम्प्रसादोऽस्माच्छरीरात्समुत्थाय परं ज्योतिरुपसंपद्य स्वेन रूपेणाभिनिष्पद्यत एष आत्मेति होवाच। (C.U. 8-3-4). The objector argues that

संप्रसाद applies to the individual soul. The answer is that the individual soul cannot be compared with the unlimited ākāśa. The refutation of the objection is provided in the very passage which states that dahara could be Brahman only and not the individual soul for the jīva cannot be identified with the limitless ākāśa that is dahara.

The sixth sūtra is उत्तराच्चेदाविर्भूतस्वरूपस्तु। (1-3-18). If it be said that dahara is the individual soul on account of subsequent statements, we say, that the subsequent passage refers to the individual soul in so far as its real nature has become manifest.

The detractor continues relying upon the subsequent passage (C.U. 8-7-1) containing the dialogue between Indra and

Virocana on the one hand and Prajāpati on the other. The whole passage forms the v.v. य एषोऽक्षिणि पुरुषो दृश्यते एष आत्मा। (C.U. 8-7-4).....एष सम्प्रसादोऽस्माच्छरीरात्समुत्थाय परं ज्योतिरुपसंपद्य स्वेनरुपेणाभिनिष्पद्यते स उत्तमः पुरुषः। (C.U. 8-3-4). The objector argues that Prajāpati, while declaring that he is teaching the truth of the self, which is free from sin, old age, death, etc. speaks only of the individual soul and it is the individual soul which rises in the form of samprasāda from the body, meets the Highest light and appears in its own form. The answer is that Prajāpati is not speaking of the individual soul qualified by the conditions of waking, dreaming and sleeping, but he is speaking of the self which has manifested its real nature.

Rāmānuja refers to a slightly earlier passage स आत्मापहतपाप्मा विजरो विमृत्युर्विशोको विजिघत्सोऽपिपासः सत्यकामः सत्यसंकल्पः सोऽन्वेष्टव्यः स विजिज्ञासितव्यः। स सर्वांश्च लोकानाप्नोति सर्वांश्च कामान् यस्तमात्मानमनुविद्य विजानातीति। (C.U. 8-7-3). The self which is free from evil, free from old age, free from death, free from grief, free from hunger and thirst, whose desire is the real, whose thought is the real. He should be sought, he should be desired to be known. He who has found out, he who understands that self he obtains all worlds and all desires.

Other commentators like Madhva, Nimbārka, and Baladeva refer to the same passage as is referred to by Rāmānuja. Vallabha does refer to the portion uttered by Prajāpati but does not specify the passage.

The seventh sūtra is अन्यार्थश्च परामर्शः। (1-3-19). And the reference to the individual soul has a different purpose. The reference to the individual soul in regard to samprasāda means that when the soul is tired of the activities of waking and dreaming and wants to rest, It goes into deep sleep. It then reaches the highest light or Brahman and so appears in its own real nature. Here the purpose of a reference to the individual soul is to draw the attention to its real nature,

Obviously the consideration of the passage previously cited अथ य एष सम्प्रसादः। is continued here.

The eighth sūtra is अल्पश्रुतेरिति चेत्तदुक्तम्। (1-3-21). If it be said that ākāśa cannot mean the Highest self on account of its being mentioned by the śruti as small, we say that point has already been considered. The sūtra alludes to the previous sūtra अर्भकौकस्त्वात्तद्व्यपदेशाच्च नेति चेन्न निचाय्यत्वादेवं व्योमवच्च। (1-2-7). For the sake of meditation, the Supreme is shown to be dwelling in the heart. Here तदुक्तम् in the sūtra refers to the previous sūtra.

In this adhikaraṇa, the consideration of the term dahara occuring in the C.U. 8-1-1 was taken up, and it was established that dahara stands for Brahman, the Supreme Reality.

Anukṛtyādhikaraṇam (1-3-22,23)

(i) अनुकृतेस्तस्य च। (1-3-22)

(ii) अपि च स्मर्यते। (1-3-23)

Before we take up the discussion of the adhikaraṇa, it may be noted that according to Rāmānuja, the previous Daharādhikaraṇa

continues upto 23, and as his interpretation being different, his v.v.s. are different. However his arrangement of the adhikaraṇa does not seem to be satisfactory. According to him the relation of an individual soul with the Supreme is being considered here and accordingly he chooses the v.v. indicating the equality of the individual soul with the Highest Self. His passage is from the M.U.

यदा पश्य: पश्यते रुक्मवर्णं कर्तारमी शं पुरुषं ब्रह्मयोनिम्।

तदा विद्वान् पुण्यपापे विधूय निरञ्जन: परमं साम्यमुपैति।। (M.U. 3-1-3)

When a seer sees the creator of golden hue, the Lord, the Person, the source of Brahman then being a knower, shaking off good and evil, and free from stain, he attains supreme equality with the Lord.

This interpretation by Rāmānuja is not satisfactory. The sūtrakāra has taken up the consideration of those passages which deal with Brahman. In the thick of this discussion suddenly he cannot change the track and introduce the topic of the jīva's status. Moreover, this subject of jīva's relation with the Higher Self forms the topic of discussion in the fourth adhyāya. Hence, Rāmānjuja's v.v.s of these two sūtras are not acceptable.

The first sūtra is अनुकृतेस्तस्य च। (1-3-22) And on account of acting (shining) after and (of the word) His, (Brahman is the source of the light of all).

The sūtra has the following passage as the v.v.

न तत्र सूर्यो भाति न चन्द्रतारकं नेमा विद्युतो भान्ति कुतोऽयमग्नि:।

तमेवभान्तमनुभाति सर्वं तस्य भासा सर्वमिदं विभाति।। (Kaṭha U. 2-2-15)

The sun shines not there, nor the moon and the stars, these lightnings shine not, where then could this fire be? Everything shines only after that shining light. His shining illumines all this world.

This, the same verse occurs in the M.U. also. Now which of the Upaniṣadic passages could have been intended here? Madhva seems to be taking the verse from the Kaṭha U. as is clear from the commentary of Madhva.

परमात्मैवानिर्देश्यसुखरूप:। न हि ज्ञानिसुखमनुभाति सर्वम्।

Now these words echo the previous verse of the Kaṭha U.

तदेतदिति मन्यन्तेऽनिर्देश्यं परमं सुखम्।

कथं नु तद्विजानीयां किमु भाति विभाति वा।। (Kaṭha U. 2-2-14)

This is that and thus they recognise, the indescribable Supreme bliss. How then, may I come to know this? Does it shine of itself or does it shine (after something else).

Moreover, the preceeding verses of the Kaṭha U. are also worthnoticing, for the word अनु is found twice in them.

एको वशी सर्वभूतान्तरात्मा एकं रूपं बहुधा यः करोति।
तमात्मस्थं येऽनुपश्यन्ति धीरास्तेषां सुखं शाश्वतं नेतरेषाम्।।

(Kaṭha U. 2-2-12)

The one, controller (of all), the inner self of all things, who wakes his one form manifold, to the wise who perceive him as abiding in the soul, to them is eternal bliss not to others.

तमात्मस्थं येऽनुपश्यन्ति धीरास्तेषां शान्तिः शाश्वती नेतरेषाम्।।

(Kaṭha U. 2-2-13)

The one eternal amid the transient, the conscious amid the conscious, the one amid many, who grants their desires, to the wise who perceive Him as abiding in the soul, to them is eternal peace and to no others.

Of course, अनु is used in these two verses in a slightly different sense, Even then, it goes to make the case of the Kaṭha U. stronger than that of the M.U. We may observe that अनु is repeated thrice including that of the v.v. The verse from the M.U. does not have any अनु in the verses either preceeding or following it. So it will be in the fitness of the things to conclude that the passage from the Kaṭha U. is being considered here as the v.v.

Moreover, in view of the immdediately succeeding, sūtras, (1-3-24 & 25) considering the Kaṭha U. passages continuity could be said to be maintained if the verse from the Kaṭha U. is considered, as the v.v.

Śaṅkara, of course, has taken up the verse from the M.U. for consideration here in the sūtra. Bhāskara and Vallabha agree with Śaṅkara.

The second sūtra is अपि च स्मर्यते। (1-3-23). And the same is declared in the smṛti. The sūtra refers to the passages from the B.G.

न तद्भासयते सूर्यो न शशाङ्को न पावकः।

यद्गत्वा न निवर्तन्ते तद्धाम परमं मम॥
यदादित्यगतं तेजो जगद्भासयतेऽखिलम्।
यच्चन्द्रमसि यच्चाग्नौ तेजो विद्धि मामकम्।। (B.G. 15,6,12)

Pramitādhikaraṇam (1-3-24, 25)

This adhikaraṇa too consists of the two sūtras :

(i) शब्दादेव प्रमित:। (1-3-24)

(ii) हृद्यपेक्षया तु मनुष्याधिकारित्वात्। (1-3-25)

The first sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is, (1-3-24). On account of the text itself, what is measured (by a thumb) is the Highest Self. The sūtra refers to a text in which the Highest Self has been mentioned as measured. Such a text could be the following from the Kaṭha U.

अङ्गुष्ठमात्र: पुरुषो ज्योतिरिवाधूमक:।
ईशानो भूतभव्यस्य स एवाद्य स उ श्व:।
एतद्वै तत्।। (Kaṭha U. 2-1-12,13)

The person of the size of a thumb resides in the middle of the body. After knowing him, who is the Lord of the past and the future, one does not shrink. This, indeed, is that.

The person of the size of a thumb resides in the middle of the body, like a flame without smoke. He is the Lord of the past and the future. He is the same today and the same tomorrow. This, indeed, is that.

The person of the size of a thumb residing in the middle of the body is the Highest Self. That this passage is the v.v. is certain, as the प्रमित: refers to the size referred to in अङ्गुष्ठमात्र: पुरुष:. The passage makes it clear that the person referred to is Brahman because He is the Lord of the past and the future and he is the same today and the same tomorrow.

The second sūtra is हृद्यपेक्षया तु मनुष्याधिकारत्वात्। (1-3-25) Keeping in view the heart however, (the Supreme is said to be the size of a thumb) because men have a right to the worship of the Supreme.

The sūtra refers to the passage occurring at the end of the Upaniṣad wherein, the Highest Self of the size of a thumb is said to be residing in the heart.

तं स्वाच्छरीरात्प्रवृहैन्मुञ्जादिवेषीकां धैर्येण।

तं विद्याच्छुक्रममृतं तं विद्याच्छुक्रममृतमिति।। (Kaṭha U. 2-3-17)

The person of the size of a thumb, the inner self, abides always in the hearts of men. Him one should draw out with patience from the body, as the wind from the reed. Him one should know as the pure, the immortal year, Him one should know as the pure, the immortal.

This sūtra introduces the topic of the consideration of the right to knowledge of various beings which is taken up in the following sūtras from 23 to 26 and even further upto 38.

Devatādhikaraṇam (1-3-26 to 33)

This adhikaraṇa consists of the following 8 sūtras :

(i) तदुपर्यपि बादरायण: संभवात्। (1-3-26)

(ii) विरोध: कर्मणीति चेन्नानेकप्रतिपत्तेर्दर्शनात्। (1-3-27)

(iii) शब्द इति चेन्नात: प्रभवात्प्रत्यक्षानुमानाभ्याम्। (1-3-28)

(iv) अत एव च नित्यत्वम्। (1-3-29)

(v) समाननामरूपत्वाच्चावृत्तावप्यविरोधो दर्शनात्स्मृतेश्च। (1-3-30)

(vi) मध्वादिष्वसंभवादनधिकारं जैमिनि:। (1-3-31)

(vii) ज्योतिषि भावाच्च। (1-3-32)

(viii) भावं तु बादरायणोऽस्ति हि। (1-3-33)

This adhikaraṇa takes up the question whether the gods are eligible for the attainment of the knowledge of Brahman. The problem is of such a nature that, there will be a consideration of different viewpoints and hence, no particular v.v. is possible for the sūtras of this and the following adhikaraṇa wherein the right of sūtras to knowledge is considered.

The first sūtra is तदुपर्यपि बादरायण: संभवात्। (1-3-26). The beings above them (men) are also qualified for the study of the Vedas, according to Bādarāyaṇa, on account of possibility. Bādarāyaṇa is of the opinion that gods above men, are capable of knowledge for it is quite possible for them and various Śrutis can be cited in support of this opinion. It is difficult to pinpoint the exact Śruti, referred to in the sūtra. Perhaps no particular Śruti is intended to be the v.v. of the sūtra. This not being a strictly philosophical problem, no statement directly referring to this could be found in the Upaniṣad. But a thesis has to be built up on the basis of

references here and there. It is stated in the C.U. that Indra stayed with Prajāpati as his disciple for 101 years, एकशतं ह वै वर्षाणि मघवान्प्रजापतौ ब्रह्मचर्यमुवास। (C.U. 8-11-3). One hundred and one years Indra lived as a disciple with Prajāpati. In the T.U. it is stated

भृगुर्वै वारुणि:। वरुणं पितरमुपससार। अधीहि भगवो ब्रह्म। (T.U.3-1)

Bhṛgu Vāruṇi went to his father Varuṇa, saying, Sir, teach me Brahman.

The next sūtra is विरोध: कर्मणीति चेन्नानेकप्रतिपत्तेर्दर्शनात्। (1-3-27) would not the possession of bodies by the gods result in a contradiction to sacrificial works?

No, because it is perceived that gods can assume many bodies simultaneously. [1]

The difficulty is mentioned that if gods have a 22body, then, when they are expected to remain present at more than one sacrificial sessions simultaneously. They would not be able to remain present everywhere and thus a contradiction would result. But the sūtrakāra points out that it is seen that a deity can assume many forms at the same time and hence no contradiction would result. Śāklya asks Yājñavalkya about the number of gods, and Yājñavalkya reduces the number of gods from 3003 to 303 to one. Śākalya asks what are those gods? Yājñavalkya replies महिमान एवैषामेते। (B.U. 3-9-12). They are but manifestations of their greatness of gods.

This may be the passage referred to here in the sūtra by the word दर्शनात्.

The third sūtra is शब्द इति चेन्नात: प्रभवात्प्रत्यक्षानुमानाभ्याम्। (1-3-28) If it be said that a contradiction will result in regard to word, we say that it is not so because perception and inference show the origination of everything from this (the word). In this sūtra, the question is considered whether the authoritativeness of the Veda is not contradicted by the attribution of bodies to divinities. The possession of body makes gods subject to the changes of birth and death, so the eternal connection of the eternal word with a non-eternal thing is incoceivable. The sūtra answers that the world with the gods and other beings originates from the Veda. Evidence of this lies in perception and inference. Perception

---

1. Tr. George C. Adams, Jr., Bādarāyaṇa's Brahmasūtras p. 98

signifies śruti and inference signifies smṛti. What could be the śruti and smṛti intended here? स मनसा वाचं मिथुनं समभवत्। (B.U. 1-2-4). He with his mind united himself with speech. स भूरिति व्याहरत्स भूमिमसृजत। (Tait. Brāhmaṇa 2-2-4-2) Uttering bhūr he created the earth. Probable smṛti passages are

अनादिनिधना नित्या वागुत्सृष्टा स्वयंभुवा।

आदौ वेदमयी दिव्या यतः सर्वाः प्रवृत्तयः।। (M.B. 12-233-24)

In the beginning, the selfborn sent forth speech, without beginning and end, eternal, made of Veda, and divine from which arose all activities and

नामरूपं च भूतानां कर्मणां च प्रवर्तनम्।

वेदशब्देभ्य एवादौ निर्ममे स महेश्वरः।। (M.S. 1-21)

That great Lord, in the beginning fashioned the name and form, activeness of the acts, out of the Vedic speech.

The fourth sūtra is अत एव च नित्यत्वम्। (1-3-29) And for this very reason the eternity of the Vedas is admitted. This sūtra is a sort of conclusion arising out of discussion in the previous sūtras.

The fifth sūtra is

समाननामरूपत्वाच्चावृत्तवप्यविरोधो दर्शनात्स्मृतेश्च।

(1-3-30) And on account of the similarity of name and form (there is) no contradiction (to the eternity of the word in the Veda) even though there may be the recurrence (of the world) (as is clear) from what is preceived (śruti) and the smṛti.

The śrutipassage is

सूर्याचन्द्रमसौ धाता यथापूर्वमकल्पयत्।

दिवं च पृथिवीं चान्तरिक्षमथो स्वः।। (RV. 10-190-3)

As formerly, the creator fashioned sun and moon, and the sky, and the air, and the heavenly world.'

The smṛti passage is

ऋषीणां नामधेयानि याश्च वेदेषु दृष्टयः।

शर्वर्यन्ते प्रसूतानां तान्येवैभ्यो ददात्यजः॥

यथर्तुष्वृतुलिङ्गानि नानारूपाणि पर्यये।

दृश्यन्ते तानि तान्येव तथा भावा युगादिषु॥

यथाभिमानिनोऽतीतास्तुल्यास्ते सांप्रतैरिह।

देवा देवैरतीतैर्हि रूपैर्नामभिरेव च।। (Viṣṇupurāṇa 1-5-64 to 66)

Whatever were the names of the ṛṣis and their powers to see the Vedas, the same the unborn one again gives to them when they are produced afresh at the end of the night. As the various signs of the seasons return in succession in their due time, thus the same beings again appear in the different yugas. And of whatever individuality the gods of the past ages were, equal to them are the present gods in name and form.

The sixth sūtra is मध्वादिष्वसंभवादनधिकारं जैमिनिः। (1-3-31). On account of the impossibility of the gods having the right to the knowledge of) honey and the rest, they (the gods) are not qualified, thus thinks Jaimini.

Thus having considered the relation between the words and the entities which was an offshoot of the consideration about the gods' qualification, the sūtrakāra states a different viewpoint regarding the right of the gods to the knowledge of honey and others. Obviously the passage under consideration is असौ वा आदित्यो देवमधु। (C.U. 3-1-1) It is stated that the sun is the honey of gods, the sky is beehive, the Vedic hymns the trees, the sacrifices are the flowers, and the offerings of Soma milk etc. are the honey itself. It is possible for men to meditate on the sun but not for the sun-god. They cannot at once, be the meditators and the objects of meditation. This is the opinion of Jaimini.

The seventh sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is ज्योतिषि भावाच्च। (1-3-32). And because (the words denoting the deities) are used in the sense of light. This is one more argument against the gods being qualified for knowledge of Brahman. The consideration of the same passage असौ वा आदित्यो देवमधु (C.U. 3-1-1) is continued.

The last sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is भावं तु बादरायणोस्ति हि। (1-3-33). Bādarāyaṇa on the other hand, (maintains) the existence (of qualification for Brahmavidyā on the part of the gods), for there are (passages indicating that). Bādarāyaṇa recognises the qualification for knowledge of Brahman on the part of the deities, for there is certainly evidence to show this. In support of this opinion the śruti from the B.U. may be cited तद्यो यो देवानां प्रत्यबुध्यत स एव तदभवत्तथर्षीणां तथा मनुष्याणाम्। (B.U. 1-4-10).

Whatever Deva was awakened (so as to know Brahman) he indeed became that, and the same with the sages, the same with mortals.

Apaśūdrādhikaraṇam (1-3-34 to 38)

The adhikaraṇa has the following sūtras :

(i) शुगस्य तदनादरश्रवणात्तदाद्रवणात्सूच्यते हि। (1-3-34)

(ii) क्षत्रियत्वगतेश्चोत्तरत्र चैत्ररथेन लिङ्गात्। (1-3-35)

(iii) संस्कारपरामर्शात्तदभावाभिलापाच्च। (1-3-36)

(iv) तदभावनिर्धारणे च प्रवृत्तेः। (1-3-37)

(v) श्रवणाध्ययनार्थप्रतिषेधात्स्मृतेश्च। (1-3-38)

In this adhikaraṇa the right of śūdras to knowledge of Brahman is considered.

The first sūtra is शुगस्य तदनादरश्रवणात्तदाद्रवणात्सूच्यते हि। (1-3-34) (Jānaśruti) felt grief because of hearing the disrespectful words (about himself) for that is indicated by his running (towards Raikva).

The Raikva episode of the C.U. is referred to in the sūtra.

It is urged that the śūdras have a right to Brahma-knowledge for they desire that knowledge and are capable of it. There is no scriptural prohibition. On the contrary, in samvargavidyā which is a part of Brahma knowledge taught to Jānaśruti is admitted. The sūtra points out that the śūdra who is not eligible for the Upanayana ceremony cannot study the Vedas and is therefore disqualified, for Brahma knowledge. The word śūdra in C.U. does not refer to caste. Jānaśruti is called śūdra because he experienced grief and ran, when Jānaśruti approaches Raikva with an entreaty to impart knowledge, Raikva reproaches him saying अह हारे त्वा शूद्र तवैव सह गोभिरस्तु। (C.U. 4-2-3). Fie, necklace and carriage be thine O, śūdra together with the cows. Here the word śūdra does not refer to caste. it refers to the grief of Jānaśruti and not to Jānaśruti himself. Jānaśruti rushed into grief (शुचमभिदुद्राव) or grief rushed on him (शुचा वा तमभिदुद्रवे) or he in his grief rushed to Raikva (शुचा वा रैक्वमभिद्राव). In this way the word śūdra with reference to Jānaśruti can be explained. Thus Raikva is referring to Jānaśruti's state of being overcome with grief by the word śūdra and not be the caste. So śūdras are not eligible for the study of the Vedas.

The second sūtra is क्षत्रियत्वगतेश्चोत्तरत्र चैत्ररथेन लिङ्गात्। (1-3-35) Jānaśruti was not a śūdra because him Kṣatriyahood is known from the inferential sign (supplied by his having been mentioned) later on with Caitraratha (who was a Kṣatriya). In the sūtra it is

sought to establish that Jānaśruti is not a śūdra, but a Kṣatriya because of an inferential sign, which is mentioned in the passage अथ ह शौनकं च कापेयमभिप्रतारिणं च काक्षसेनिं परिविष्यमाणौ ब्रह्मचारी बिभिक्षे। (C.U. 4-3-5) Once while Śaunaka Kāpeya and Abhipratārin Kākṣaseni were being served at their meal, a religious student begged of them. Abhipratārins are Caitrarathas as Caitrarathas are connected with Kāpeyas. It is stated in the śruti अयाजयन्। (Tāṇḍya Brāhmaṇa 20-12-5) The Kāpeyas made Caitraratha perform that sacrifice. Moreover, from the śruti we understand that Caitraratha was a prince.

तस्माच्चैत्ररथिनामैक: क्षत्रपतिरजायत। (Tāṇḍya Brāhmaṇa 20-12-5)

From him a Caitrarathi descended who was a prince. As Caitaratha is mentioned as a prince, we must understand him to be a Kṣatriya. Here in the C.U. Jānaśruti is being praised in the same vidyā with the Kṣatriya Abhipratārin. This fact indicated that Jānaśruti was a Kṣatriya and not a śūdra, Hence, the śūdras are not qualified for the knowledge of Brahman.

The third sūtra is संस्कारपरामर्शात्तदभावाभिलापाच्च् (1-3-36)

On account of the mention of the ceremonies (purificatory in the case of the three twice born castes) and the mention of the absence of those (in the case of the fourth caste). Sacred-thread ceremony is mentioned in case of the three upper castes but it is specifically stated that this is not to be performed in case of the fourth śūdra caste. तान्हानुपनीयैव। (C.U. 5-11-7). He without having made them undergo the Upanayana. Manusmṛti explicitely states न शूद्रे पातकं किंचिन्न च संस्कारमर्हति (Manusmṛti 10-12-6). In the śūdra there is not any sin, and he is not fit for any ceremony,

The fourth sūtra is तदभावनिर्धारणे च प्रवृत्ते:। (1-3-37). And because of Gautama's proceeding to imitate Jābāla on the ascertainment of the absence of that (i.e. his śūdrahood).

The Satyakāma-Jābāla-episode is under consideration in which Satyakāma approached Gautama with a request to initiate him. He spoke the truth from which the preceptor inferred that he was not a śūdra and therefore initiated him;

नैतदब्राह्मणो विवक्तुमर्हति समिधं सोम्याहरोप त्वा नेष्ये न सत्यादगा:। (C.U. 4-4-5) None who is not a Brahmana would thus speak. Fetch fuel, friend, I shall initiate you. You have not swerved from the truth.

The fifth sūtra is श्रवणाध्ययनार्थप्रतिषेधात्स्मृतेश्च (1-3-38)

And because the śūdra is forbidden by smṛti from hearing and study (of the Vedas) and understanding their meaning.

There are injunctions of the smṛti which debar śūdras from studying the Vedic literature अथास्य वेदमुपशृण्वतस्त्रपुजतुभ्यां श्रोत्रप्रतिपूरणम्। (Gautama-Dharma śāstra 12-4). The ears of him who hears the Veda are to be filled with (molten) lead and lac. भवति च वेदोच्चारणे जिह्वाच्छेदो धारणे शरीरभेद:। (Gautama Dharmaśāstra (12-5, 6) His tongue is to be slit if he pronounces it, his body is to be cut through, if he preserves it.

It may be noted here that some scholars consider the sūtras from 1-3-26 to 1-3-38 as an interpolation. Raja Bahadur Srisa Chandra Vasu comments upon the sūtra 34, 'This is a very forced meaning given to the word śūdra, the whole of this adhikaraṇa about śūdras together with the preceeding one about Devas, appears to be an interpolation of (sic) some later author. There is a break in the continuity of the aphorisms by the eruption of these two adhikaraṇas. That they are a digression is admitted by both Rāmānuja and Baladeva. Bādarāyaṇa was not illiberalminded, as the anonymous author of these interpolated sūtras tries to make him out'.[1] Further he indignantly observes 'Practically the whole of India has become a vast śūdra camp now a days uneducated, ignorant and not knowing the Vedas. The repressive policy of the Brāhmaṇas in prohibiting the śūdras from studying the Vedas has recoiled upon them, and the Brahmana class as a whole, is as much degraded as the śūdra in these days. Injustice always brings its own punishment.'[2] Radhakrishnan writes 'The discussion of the right for Brahmaknowledge was a digression'[3]

George C. Adams, Jr. also expresses a similar opinion.[4]

---

1. The Vedantasūtras of Bādarāyaṇa with The Commentary of Baladeva, Tr. by Raja Bahadur Srisachandra Vasu, note on p. 149
2. Ibid, note on p. 153
3. S. Radhakrishnan, The Brahmasūtra, p. 309
4. This also is an unusual section in that it is the first section of the Brahmasūtras which does not have as its subject the nature of Brahman,...The entire section seems to be rather out of place in the context of the rest of the Brahmasūtras, and if not for the fact that all of the expositions include it, we would be inclined to suspect that this section is not part of Bādarāyaṇa's work but rather represents a later addition.

Kampanādhikaraṇam (1-3-39).

This adhikaraṇa has only one sūtra कम्पनात्। (1-3-39) On account of trembling of the world the life principle is Brahman.

Now after digression again we turn back to the meaning of the Vedānta texts. The passage under consideration is from Kaṭha U. (2-3-2) The passage is यदिदं किं च जगत्सर्वं प्राण एजति निःसृतम्।
महद्भयं वज्रमुद्यतं य एतद्विदुरमृतास्ते भवन्ति।। (Kaṭha U. 2-3-2)

The whole world, whatever here, exists, springs from and moves in life. (It is) the fear (like) the upraised thunderbolt. They that know, that become immortal.

It can be observed that the sūtrakāra has used the word कम्पनात् for the word एजति of the Upaniṣad obviously guided by expression एजृ कम्पने in Dhātupāṭha. Doubt is raised whether this prāṇa-life principle could be air. But the context makes it clear that it must be Brahman only. In the passage preceeding the passage quoted here, viz. तदेव शुक्रं तद्ब्रह्मतदेवामृतमुच्यते। तस्मिंल्लोकाः श्रिताः सर्वे तदु नात्येति कश्चन। (Kaṭha U. 2-3-1)

That (indeed) is the pure, that is Brahman. That indeed is called immortal. In it all the worlds rest and no one ever goes beyond it. Brahman is referred to. This also suggests the conclusion that Brahman is referred to here.

Jyotiradhikaraṇam (1-3-40)

This adhikaraṇa too has one sūtra only i.e. ज्योतिर्दर्शनात्। (1-3-40). The light is Brahman because it is perceived.

This sūtra is again a hard nut to crack because the word ज्योतिः is one of the most frequently occurring words in the Upaniṣadic literature.

Let us consider the passages considered by the various commentators. Śaṅkara takes the passage from the C.U.

एष सम्प्रसादोऽस्माच्छरीरात्समुत्थाय परं ज्योतिरूपसंपद्य स्वेन रूपेणाभिनिष्पद्यते। (C.U. 8-12-3) This serene one when he rises from this body, reaching the highest light appears in his own form. The passage containing this sentence has been thoroughly discussed in the दहराधिकरणम् (1-3-14 to 21) particularly in the sūtras 18 इतरपरामर्शात्स इति चेन्नासंभवात्। and 20 अन्यार्थश्च परामर्शः। It is not likely that the sūtrakāra would return to it in the same pāda.

Rāmānuja considers the Kaṭha U. passage

न तत्र सूर्यो भाति न चन्द्रतारकं नेमा विद्युतो भान्ति कुतोऽयमग्निः।
तमेव भान्तमनुभाति सर्वं तस्य भासा सर्वमिदं विभाति।। (Kaṭha U. 2-2-15)

The sun shines not there, nor the moon and the stars, these lightenings shine not, where then could this fire be? Everything shines only after that shining light. His shining illumines all this world.

This too cannot form the v.v. of this sūtra as it too has been considered in the sūtra अनुकृतेस्तस्य च। (1-3-22) and the word ज्योतिः is missing from here.

Madhva takes up the passage from the B.U.

योऽयं विज्ञानमयः पुरुषः प्राणेषु हृद्यन्तर्ज्योतिः (b.u. 4-3-7) which too has been contextually determined in the Ānandamayādhi-karaṇam. So this passage is also not likely to be pertinent here to point out that in the sūtra अनुकृतेस्तस्य च। (1-3-22) we had opted for the Kaṭha U. passage which is identical with the passage from the M.U. cited here. So it would be in the fitness of the things if the passage just preceeding the passage न तत्र... (M.U. 2-2-11) i.e. तच्छुभ्रं ज्योतिषां ज्योतिः। (M.U. 2-2-10) is considered the v.v. of this sūtra. Before this passage is the verse of the M.U. i.e.

भिद्यते हृदयग्रन्थिश्छिद्यन्ते सर्वसंशयाः।
क्षीयन्ते चास्य कर्माणि तस्मिन्दृष्टे परावरे।। (M.U. 2-2-9).

The knot of the heart is cut, all doubts dispelled, and his actions decay when he is seen, the higher and the lower.

तस्मिन्दृष्टे परावरे refers to Brahman, the Highest Reality. In the passage following this which forms the v.v. of the sūtra

हिरण्मये परे कोशे विरजं ब्रह्म निष्कलम्।
तच्छुभ्रं ज्योतिषां ज्योतिस्तद्यदात्मविदो विदुः।। (M.U. 2-2-10)

In the highest golden sheath is Brahman, without stain, without parts. That lustre is the light of lights. That is what the knowers of self know.

Evidently here, the term ज्योतिः refers to the Supreme Being.

Arthāntaravyapadeśādhikaraṇam (1-3-41)

This is also a one-sūtra-adhikaraṇa. The sūtra is आकाशोऽर्थान्तरत्वादिव्यपदेशात्। (1-3-41). Space is Brahman since it is designated as something different in meaning and so on.

The passage under consideration is from the C.U.

आकाशो वै नामरूपयोर्निर्वहिता ते यदन्तरा तद्ब्रह्म तंदमृतं स आत्मा। (C.U. 8-14-1)

He who is called space is the revealer of all forms and names. That within which these forms and names are contained is the Brahman, the Immortal. He is the self.

Attention must be drawn to the fact that on the previous occasion in the sūtra प्रसिद्धेश्च। (1-3-17) when Śaṅkara proposed this passage as the v.v., we had rejected it on the ground that, it was rather, too far removed from the context and opted for some other passage (अथ य एष सम्प्रसादो... ब्रह्मणो नाम सत्यमिति। (C.U. 8-3-4) nearer, more suitable.

But in the present context, the sūtrakāra seems to have in mind this passage referred to above, because of the context in which the discussion about आकाश is placed. Here the space is the Supreme Brahman. Elemental ether cannot be meant here, as this ākāśa is said to be determining the name and form, and hence it cannot be said to be नामरूपयोर्निर्वहिता as भामती says भूताकाशं च विकारत्वेन नामरूपान्त:पाति सत् कथमात्मानमुद्वहेत।

Suṣupotyutkrāntyadhikaraṇam (1-3-42, 43)

The last adhikaraṇa of this pāda consists of the two sūtras viz. (i) सुषुप्त्युत्क्रान्त्योर्भेदेन। (1-3-42) (ii) पत्यादिशब्देभ्य:। (1-3-43)

The first sūtra is सुषुप्त्युत्क्रान्तयोर्भेदेन। (1-3-42). On account of the mention of the Highest Self, as different (from the individual soul) in the state of sleep and departure (from the body).

The v.v. of this sūtra is the passages from the B.U. beginning with कतम आत्मेति योऽयं विज्ञानमय:। (B.U. 4-3-17) Who is that Self? He who is consisting of knowledge. The whole of the third section extending upto 4-22 may form the subject of discussion of this adhikaraṇa. The opening, middle and concluding parts of the discourse pertain to the embodied self, and hence, it may be surmised that the embodied self must be the theme of the discourse. But tne sūtrakāra points out two distinguishing features of the discourse i.e. in the state of deep sleep and with reference to departure, the Highest Self is mentioned, in the state of deep sleep. अयं पुरुष: प्राज्ञेनात्मा संपरिष्वक्तो न बाह्यं किंचन वेद नान्तरम्। (B.U. 4-3-21) This person embraced by the intelligent (प्राज्ञ) Self knows nothing that is without, nothing that is within. At the time of departure also it is stated अयं शारीर आत्मा प्राज्ञेनात्मनान्वारूढ उत्सर्जन्याति।

(B.U. 4-3-25). This embodied self mounted by the intelligent self moves along leaving.

So in the beginning also, योऽयं विज्ञानमयः प्राणेषु (B.U. 4-3-7) He who is consisting of knowledge among prāṇas.

The last sūtra of the adhikaraṇa and pāda is पत्यादि शब्देभ्यः। (1-3-43). On account of the words Lord and others the Highest Self is meant. The sūtra obviously has this passage from the same Upaniṣad i.e. B.U. as the v.v. सर्वस्य वशी सर्वस्येशानःसर्वस्याधिपतिः। (B.U. 4-4-22) He is the lord of all, the king of all things, the protector of all things. These words cannot refer to the embodied soul.

Rāmānuja takes the three sūtras 41-43 as constituting one अधिकरण dealing with the question whether the term ākāśa indicates Brahman or a released soul. In the sūtras 42 and 43 Rāmānuja quotes the same passages from the B.U. as done by Śaṅkara. Rāmānuja's raising the question about the soul in released state does not appear to be appropriate here in the context when, the various terms are taken up for consideration that they indicate Brahman or not. So Rāmānuja's interpretation does not appear to be natural.

Viṣayavākyas of the 1-4-1 to 28

Ānumānikādhikaraṇam (1-4-1 to 7)

This adhikaraṇa consists of the following seven sūtras viz. (i) आनुमानिकमप्येकेषामिति चेन्न शरीररूपकविन्यस्तगृहीतेयं दर्शयति च। (1-4-1)

(ii) सूक्ष्मं तु तदर्हत्वात्। (1-4-1)

(iii) तदधीनत्वादर्थवत्। (1-4-3)

(iv) ज्ञेयत्वावचनाच्च। (1-4-4)

(v) वदतीति चेन्न प्राज्ञो प्रकरणात्। (1-4-5)

(vi) त्रयाणामेव च उपन्यासः प्रश्नश्च। (1-4-6)

(vii) महद्वच्च। (1-4-7)

'According to Śaṅkara and other commentators, the purpose of this pāda is by and large,' to quote B.N.K. Sharma 'to demonstrate the aśabdatva of Prakṛti presumed in the sūtra 1-1-5 and to show how certain expression and passages in the śrutis which appear to refer to certain principles and categories of Sāṁkhya philosophy such as Avyakta (Prakṛti) have nothing to

do with them and refer, instead, to something connected with the Vedānta doctrine.'[1]

Coming to this adhikaraṇa Madhva includes the first sūtra of the next adhikaraṇa (चमसवदविशेषात् 1-4-8) in this adhikaraṇa and splits the fifth sūtra into two viz.

वदतीति चेन्न प्राज्ञो and हि प्रकरणात्. Thus according to Madhva, the adhikaraṇa has nine sūtras. All the other commentators follow Śaṅkara, महतः परमव्यक्तमव्यक्तात्पुरुषः परः।

The passage under discussion in this adhikaraṇa is from the Kaṭha U. परमव्यक्तमव्यक्तात्पुरुषः परः। (Kaṭha U. 1-3-11) Beyond the Great, there is the Undeveloped, beyond Undeveloped, there is the Person. Most of the commentators agree regarding the passage being the v.v. of this adhikaraṇa.

But Vijñānabhikṣu differs from the other commentators. According to him, the passage under discussion in this adhikaraṇa is from the S.U. i.e. (S.U. 4-5).

A case can be made out in favour of Vijñānabhikṣu's v.v.

The wording of the sūtras, to some extent, seems applicable to the context of this passage from the S.U. also. If there are questions in the Kaṭha U., so are there in the S.U. also. In the beginning of the S.U. also, the questions are asked i.e.

किं कारणं ब्रह्म कुतः स्म जाता जीवाम केन क्व च संप्रतिष्ठाः।
अधिष्ठिताः केन सुखेतरेषु वर्तामहे ब्रह्मविदो व्यवस्थाम्।। (S.U. 1-1)

What is the cause? (Is it) Brahman? Whence are we born? By what do we live? And on what are we established? O ye who know Brahman, (tell us) presided over by whom do we live our different conditions in pleasures and other then pleasures.

The whole of the S.U. is an answer to these questions. So the adhikaraṇa according to Vijñānabhikṣu has the v.v. from the S.U. Vijñānabhikṣu has the following to say

आनुमानिकमप्येकेषाम् इत्यारभ्य सर्वाणि सूत्राणि सांख्ययोगसिद्धानां प्रधानमहदादिपदार्थानां स्वरूपप्रतिषेधतया यथा कथंचित् व्याचक्षते। तत्तु श्रुति स्मृतिन्यायादिविरोधादुपेक्षणीयं मुमुक्षुभिः। यच्च तेषामजाशब्दस्य भूतत्रयपरतया व्याख्यानं तदपि हेयम्।

---

1. Sharma B.N.K., The Brahmasūtras and Their Commentaries Vol. 1, p. 260

Some explain somehow, all the sūtras beginning from Ānumānikamapyekeṣām in such a way that the categories of Pradhāna, Mahat etc. of the Sāṁkhyayoga negate their own nature. This should be ignored by the liberation seekers as it is against the śruti, smṛti, nyāya etc. Moreover, their explanation of Ajā representing the three elements is also to be abjured.

Thus he repudiates the interpretation put forth by Śaṅkara and other commentators.

But we have to take into account what Śaṅkara states to be one purpose of the pāda कासुचिच्छाखासु प्रधानसमर्पणाभासानां शब्दानां श्रूयमाणत्वात्। अत: प्रधानस्य कारणत्वं वेदसिद्धमेव महद्भि: परमर्षिभि: कपिलप्रभृतिभि: परिगृहीतमिति प्रसज्यते तद्यावत्तेषां शब्दानामन्यपरत्वं न प्रतिपाद्यते, तद्यावत्सर्वज्ञं ब्रह्मजगत्कारणमिति प्रतिपादितमव्याकुलीभवेत्। अत: तेषामन्यापरत्वं दर्शयितुं पर: संदर्भ: प्रवर्तते।

Some śākhās contain expressions which seem to propound the concept of the Pradhāna of Sāṁkhyas. From this it follows that Kapila and other highly venerable sages maintain the doctrine of the Pradhāna being the general cause even because it is based on the Veda. As long therefore as it has not been proved that those passages to which the Sāṁkhyas refer have a different meaning, all the previous discussion as to the omniscient Brahman being the cause of the world would come to nought. Hence now begins a new section which aims at proving that those passages actually have a different meaning.

So the terms apparently seeming to signify the Sāṁkhya principles have to be taken up for consideration from as many various śrutis as possible. Then naturally the v.v. of the first adhikaraṇa would be different from that of the second and the third and so on.

But ultimately the wording of the sūtras of the adhikaraṇa and context of the Upaniṣads are favourable to the v.v. pointed out by Śaṅkara. In the first sūtra of the adhikaraṇa there is a reference to शरीररूपक which obviously refers to the metaphor in the Kaṭha U. i.e. आत्मानं रथिनं विद्धि.. and so on, in 1-3-3 and 1-3-4, before the passage already alluded to.

Moreover, the sixth sūtra refers to the three questions. Now these questions are three only in the Kaṭha U. not more not less

but in the S.U. there are more than three questions. So the sūtra 1-4-6 tilts the balance in favour of the Kaṭha U. passage being the v.v. Hence the first adhikaraṇa has the Kaṭha U. passage as the v.v. Now having arrived at this conclusion our job is easier when we try to explain the sūtras individually.

The first sūtra is आनुमानिकमप्येकेषामिति चेन्न शरीररूपकविन्यस्त-गृहीतेर्दर्शयति च। (1-4-1)

If it be said that some (mention) that which is based on inference i.e. the pradhāna), we deny this because (the term alluded to) refers to what is contained in the simile of the body and (that the text) shows. The passage under consideration is महत: परमव्यक्तमव्यक्तात्पुरुष: पर:। (Kaṭha U. 1-3-11) Beyond the great, there is the Undeveloped, beyond the Undeveloped, there is the Person.

This passage comes after another passage where the simile of the chariot is employed

आत्मानं रथिनं विद्धि शरीरं रथमेव तु।
बुद्धिं तु सारथिं विद्धि मन: प्रग्रहमेव च॥
इन्द्रियाणि हयानाहुर्विषयांस्तेषु गोचरान्।
आत्मेन्द्रियमनोयुक्तं भोक्तेत्याहुर्मनीषिण: ।। Kaṭha U. 1-3-4

Know the self as the lord of the chariot and the body as verily the chariot. know the intellect as the charioteer and the mind as verily reins.

The senses, they say, are the horses, the objects of the senses the paths, (they range over), the self associated with the body, the senses and the mind-wise men declare is the enjoyer.

In both these verses, the simile of the body to which the sūtra refers is employed.

The second sūtra is सूक्ष्मं तदर्हत्वात्। (1-4-2). The word अव्यक्त means, however, the subtle body for this is the appropriate meaning of that word. If it is said that the gross physical body is व्यक्त, manifested, and not अव्यक्त the sūtra points out that अव्यक्त means the subtle body from which the gross body originates.

The third sūtra is तदधीनत्वादर्थवत्। (1-4-3). On account of dependence on him, it has got a meaning. Even the non-manifest world is dependent upon the Highest God. So even if अव्यक्त means the Unmanifest subtle body, it is clear that the Kaṭha U. passage

does not refer to प्रधान. The word chariot refers to both gross and subtle bodies.

The fourth sūtra is ज्ञेयत्वावचनाच्च। (1-4-4) Also, because there is no mention of its being something that should be known. In the Kaṭha U. passages the term is not mentioned as an object of knowledge or meditation.

The fifth sūtra is वदतीति चेन्न प्राज्ञो हि प्रकरणात्। (1-4-5). And if it be said that pradhāna as the object of knowledge is mentioned in the śruti, we say that it is not so for the intelligent self is meant on account of the general subject matter. The context of the Kaṭha U. makes it abundantly clear that the intelligent self is the object of knowledge.

अशब्दमस्पर्शमरूपमव्ययं तथारसं नित्यमगन्धवच्च यत्।
अनाद्यनन्तं महतः परं ध्रुवं निचाय्य तं मृत्युमुखात् प्रमुच्यते।।

(Kaṭha U. 1-3-15)

The self is without word, without touch, and without form, undecaying is likewise, without taste, eternal, without smell, without beginning, without end, beyond the great abiding, by discerning that, one is freed from the face of death.

यच्छेद्वाङ्मनसी प्राज्ञस्तद्यच्छेज्ज्ञान आत्मनि।
ज्ञानमात्मनि महति नियच्छेतद्यच्छेच्छान्त आत्मनि।।

(Kaṭha 1-3-13)

The wise man should restrain speech in mind, the latter he should restrain in the understanding self. The understanding he should restrain in the great self. That he should restrain in the tranquil self.

Here the wise man is exhorted to seek the Highest Self and not the Pradhāna. (The prājña of this mantra should not be confused with the prājña of the sūtra).

The sixth sūtra is त्रयाणामेव च उपन्यासः प्रश्नश्च। (1-4-6) And thus there are statement and question about three things alone. There is no separate question-answer in regard to pradhāna. But there are three questions and answers to the same.

The sūtra is in a way an excellent summing up of the Kaṭha U. In all there are three questions asked by Naciketas and Yama provides answers to all of them.

स त्वमग्निं स्वर्गमध्येषि मृत्यो प्रवृहितं श्रद्धानाय मह्यम्।
स्वर्गलोका अमृतत्वं भजन्त एतत् द्वितीयेन वृणे वरेण।।

(Kaṭha U. 1-1-13)

Thou knowest, O Death, that fire (sacrifice which is) the aid to heaven. Describe it to me, full of faith, how the dwellers in heaven gain immortality. Thus, I choose, as my second boon.

The answer to this question provided by Yama is

प्र ते ब्रवीमि तदु ते निबोध स्वर्ग्यमग्निं नचिकेतः प्रजानन्।
अनन्तलोकाप्तिमथ ते प्रतिष्ठां विद्धि त्वमेतं निहीतं गुहोयाम्।।

(Kaṭha U. 1-1-14)

Yama said : Knowing well as I do, that fire (which is) the aid to heaven, I shall describe it to thee, learn it of me O Naciketas. Know that fire to be the means of attaining the boundless world, as the support (of the universe) and as abiding in the secret place (of the heart).

The second question by Naciketas is

येयं प्रेते विचिकित्सा मनुष्येऽस्तीत्येके नायमस्तीति चैके।
एतद्विद्यामनुशिष्टस्त्वयाहं वराणामेष वरस्तृतीयः।। (Kaṭha U. 1-1-20)

There is this doubt in regard to a man who has departed, some holding that he is and some that he is not, I would be instructed by thee in this knowledge of the boons this is the third boon.

The answer to this question is furnished by Yama is in the 1-2-1 to 12 portion. (Kaṭha U. 1-2-2)

Both the good and the pleasant approach a man. The wise man, pondering over them discriminates. The wise chooses the good in preference to pleasant. The simple minded for the sake of wordly well-being prefers the pleasant.

The third query raised by Naciketas is

अन्यत्र धर्मादन्यत्राधर्मादन्यत्रास्मात्कृताकृतात्।
अन्यत्र भूताच्च भव्याच्च यत्तत्पश्यसि तद्वद।। (Kaṭha U. 1-2-14)

Tell me that which thou seest beyond right and wrong beyond what is done or not done, beyond past and future. In answer to the third query by Naciketas, Yama explains the significance of Aum.

सर्वे वेदा यत्पदमामनन्ति तपांसि सर्वाणि च यद्वदन्ति।
यदिच्छन्तो ब्रह्मचर्यं चरन्ति तत्ते पदं संग्रहेण ब्रवीम्योमित्येतत्।।
(Kaṭha U. 1-2-15)

That word which all the Vedas declare, which all the austerities proclaim, desiring which (peoples) live the life of a religious student, that word to thee I shall tell in brief; That is Oum.

The last sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is महद्वच्च। And like the great.

Mahat is also a term of the Sāṁkhya philosophy. But here the word महत् is not employed in the Sāṁkhya sense. Similarly the term अव्यक्त does not signify the Sāṁkhya principle बुद्धेरात्मा महान्परः। (Kaṭha U. 1-3-10)

The self is beyond intellect. (Kaṭha U. 1-2-22) The great omnipresent Self.

Here the word महत् is not used in the Sāṁkhya sense.

So अव्यक्त does not connote the principle regarded as the Highest in the Sāṁkhya philosophy.

According to Śaṅkara, अव्यक्त is हिरण्यगर्भ the first-born of the creation of अव्यक्त. For Śaṅkara अव्यक्त is prakṛti, that is मायाशक्ति or subtle body.

According to Rāmānuja, महत् is the individual self kartṛ which is indwelt by the Highest Self. For Rāmānuja अव्यक्त is the body, or the chariot. It is called because the subtle body and not the gross body is referred to.

For Madhva the word अव्यक्त denotes the Supreme Lord.

For Vallabha महत् is ब्रह्म and अव्यक्त is भगवत्कृपा, as it is not manifest to all. It also means अक्षरब्रह्म.

Camasādhikaraṇam (1-4-8 to 10) This adhikaraṇa has the following three sūtras :

(i) चमसवदविशेषात्। (1-4-8)

(ii) ज्योतिरूपक्रमा तु तथा ह्यधीयत एके। (1-4-9)

(iii) कल्पनोपदेशाच्च मध्वादिवदविरोधः। (1-4-10)

Madhva differs from the rest of the commentators in tagging this sūtra चमसवदविशेषात्। (1-4-8) as a part of the previous adhikaraṇa i.e. Ānumānikādhikaraṇam and regarding a new

adhikaraṇa starting from the sūtra 1-4-9. Similarly Madhva differs regarding the v.v. also, but of that later on.

The first sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is चमसवदविशेषात्। (1-4-8) (It cannot be maintained that ajā means the pradhāna) because no special characteristic is stated; as in the case of the cup. The adhikaraṇa continues the discussion about the Sāṁkhya interpretation of scripture. The sūtra and the adhikaraṇa has the following passage from the S.U. as the v.v.

अजामेकां लोहितशुक्लकृष्णां बह्वीः प्रजाः सृजमानां सरूपाः।
अजो ह्येको जुषमाणोऽनुशेते जहात्येनां भुक्तभोगामजोऽन्यः।। (S.U. 4-5)

The One, unborn, red white and black, who produces manifold offspring similar in form (to herself) there lies the one unborn (male) delighting. Another unborn gives her up, having had its enjoyment.

Here the advocates of Pradhāna maintain that ajā she-goat of red, white and black colours which produces manifold offspring similar in form refers to Pradhāna which has the three gunas : sattva, rajas and tamas. The sūtrakāra answers that, there is no special reason why ajā should be treated as signifying pradhāna.

The illustration of चमस in the sūtra refers to the B.U. passage अर्वाग्बिलश्चमस उर्ध्वबुध्नः। (B.U. 2-2-3) There is a bowl with its mouth below and bottom up. This by itself does not tell us what bowl it is but in the next passage it is explained that the bowl refers to the head.[1] Similarly the meaning of the ajā has to be ascertained from some other passage.

The second sūtra is ज्योतिरूपक्रमा तु तथा ह्यधीयत एके। (1-4-9) But the (elements) beginning with light are meant by the term ajā), for some read so in their text. Ajā does not refer to गुणत्रयलक्षणा अजा but it refers to भूतत्रयलक्षणा अजा as Śaṅkara would explain it. C.U. states यदग्रे रोहितं रूपं तेजसस्तद्रूपं यच्छुक्लं यत्कृष्णं तदनन्तरम्। (C.U. 6-4-1)

---

1. अर्वाग्बिलश्चमस ऊर्ध्वबुध्न इतीयं तच्छिर एष ह्यर्वाग्बिलश्चमस ऊर्ध्वबुध्नस्तस्मिन्यशो निहितं विश्वरूपमिति। (B.U. 2-2-3) and Commentary by Śaṅkara on the Upaniṣad
यथा स्तेमश्चमसे एवं तस्मिच्छिरसि विश्वरूपं...etc.
ईशादिदशोपनिषदः शांकरभाष्यसमेताः p. 747

This passge refers to the colours : red, white and black. These are the colours or the three elements viz. fire, water and earth.

Here Madhva's viewpoint may be mentioned. Madhva regards the adhikaraṇa as beginning with this sūtra and his v.v. is वसन्ते वसन्ते ज्योतिषा यजेत।

Dr. B.N.K. Sharma elucidates the inherent thinking in this adhikaraṇa, according to Madhva as follows, 'This adhikaraṇa focusses attention on all forms of words, drawn passages belonging to the sphere of karmakāṇḍa relating to names of sacrifices like Jyotiṣṭoma and their accessories, the seasons like vasanta (spring) when they are to be performed, words of call, offering, and invocations such as āgaccha, (a) yajeta, svāhā, vaṣaṭ vauṣaṭ, phaṭ and so on, for purposes of Brahma-Samanvaya.'[1] In fixing the v.v. the word jyotiḥ in the sūtra is relied upon.' B.N.K. Sharma further writes, 'The term jyotiḥ in the sūtra represents the v.v. vasante vasante jyotiṣā yajeta-a well known Brāhmaṇa text laying down the performance of the Jyotiṣṭoma. By extension it stands for the names of several other sacrifices also, and their accesories. Though the term 'Vasante' happens to be the first one, in the v.v. preference has been given to the term jyotiḥ in the sūtra as it represents the name of a principal sacrifice which is the pattern of several others and has its own vikṛtis, statement of reward etc. all together.'[2]

This reasoning is not acceptable. First of all, it would be a bit erratic for the sūtrakāra to take up the discussion of the words belonging to the sphere of karmakāṇḍa in the midst of a continuous discussion of terms apparently having Sāṁkhya connotations. Dr. Thibaut points out the objective of this pāda as follows. 'The last pāda of the first adhyāya is specially directed against the Sāṁkhya.

' It is directed specially and avowedly against Sāṁkhya interpretation of scripture'[3]

Secondly, the argument of Samnvaya put forth by the learned scholar (B.N.K. Sharma) is specious indeed! In the name of

1. Sharma B.N.K., The Brahmasūtras and their Principal Commentaries, Vol I, p. 203
2. Ibid p. 275
3. George Thibaut, the Vedānta Sūtras, pt. I, Introduction p. xiv.

Samanvaya, then, anything can be taken up for consideration, throwing the logic and inherent system of the Brahmasūtra to the winds!

Thirdly the term jyotiḥ too is of a highly general nature and hence it cannot be taken as an indicator of the v.v. Had the sūtrakāra really meant to take up the term belonging to karmakāṇḍa, deviating from the discussion on hand he would have given an unambiguous hint about it, instead of employing a term of general nature. He would have inserted वसन्ते in the sūtra. Because even then, वसन्ते would have stood for all other sacrifices.

Thus the v.v. of Madhava is not acceptable.

In the case of Śaṅkara and other commentators, it is most natural to take up the discussion of the S.U. passage as it appears to be tinged with Sāṁkhya philosophy which forms the general topic of discussion to this fourth pāda.

The third sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is कल्पनोपदेशाच्च मध्वादिवदविरोध:। (1-4-10) And on account of the statement of the assumption (of a metaphor), there is nothing contradictory in accepting ajā as denoting the original cause just as in the case of honey (denoting the sun) and similar cases. If ajā is taken to mean the three elements of the C.U. how can the three elements be conceived as having the form of the she-goat or be thought of as unproduced, since they are the products of māyā? The sūtra gives the answer. Even as the sun is imagined as honey देवमधु (C.U. 3-1), the speech as cow धेनुमुपासीत् (B.U. 5-8-1), the heavenly world as fire द्युलोकादीनां चानग्नीनामग्नित्वम्। (B.U. 8-2-9) similarly, प्रकृति which consists of fire, water and the earth is imagined to be the she-goat.

Sankhyopaśangrahādhikaraṇam (1-4-11 to 13)

This adhikaraṇa consists of the following three sūtras:

(i) न संख्योपसंग्रहादपि नानाभावदतिरेकाच्च। (1-4-11)

(ii) प्राणादयो वाक्यशेषात्। (1-4-12)

(iii) ज्योतिषैकेषामसत्यन्ने। (1-4-13)

As far as the tracing of the v.v. of this adhikaraṇa is concerned, it is smoothsailing. All the commentators consider the passage

यस्मिन्पञ्च पञ्चजना आकाशश्च प्रतिष्ठितः।

तमेव मन्य आत्मानं विद्वान्ब्रह्मामृतोऽमृतम्॥ (B.U. 4-4-17)

That in which the five groups of five and space are established, that alone I regard as the self knowing that immortal Brahman, I am immortal.

These five groups of five make twenty five and this is the number of principles according to the Sāṁkhya philosophy. So the term पञ्चपञ्चजनाः passage refers to the Sāṁkhya categories, thus maintains the Sāṁkhya protagonist.

The first sūtra is न संख्योपसंग्रहादपि नानाभावादतिरेकाच्च। (1-4-11) (The assertion that there is scriptural authority for the pradhāna etc) can also not be based on the alleged mention of the number (of the Sāṁkhya categories) on account of the diversity (of the categories) and on account of the excess (over the number of these categories).

The sūtrakāra states that this number does not point to Sāṁkhya categories, because, each one the twenty five principles of the Sāṁkhya is different from others. The twentyfive categories of Sāṁkhya are as follows : 1 प्रकृति + 1 महत् + 1 अहंकार 5 tanmātras + 5 karmendriyas + mind + 5 jñānendiriyas + 5 mahābhūtas + puruṣa. Now these 25 categories cannot be classed into five groups of five principles there being no common quality among the members of any group. At the most there are four groups of five each viz. 5 karmendriyas 5 jñānendriyas, 5 mahābhūtas and 5 tanmātras.

Moreover, the passage from the Upaniṣad refers to those five as being in Brahma which is not applicable to the Sāṁkhya categories. Moreover, ātman and ākāśa stated independently in the passage would be in excess of the number of these Sāṁkhya categories, as these categories include ākāśa and ātman in themselves.

The second sūtra is प्राणादयो वाक्यशेषात्। (1-4-12) (The pañcajanāḥ are) the breath and so on (as is seen) from the complementary passage. The subsequent passage clarifying the pañcajanāḥ is प्राणस्य प्राणमुत चक्षुषश्चक्षुरुत श्रोत्रस्य श्रोत्रमन्नस्यान्नं मनसो ये मनो विदुः। (B.U. 4-4-18)

They who know the breath of breath, the eye of the eye, the ear of the ear, the food of the food, the mind of mind. Thus the pañcajanāḥ refers to the life principle and other beings such as gods, fathers, gandharvas, asuras, and rākṣasas and so on. This has no connection with the Sāṁkhya categories.

The third sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is ज्योतिषैकेषामसत्यन्ने। (1-4-13) In case of the text of some, i.e. the Kāṇvas, where food is not mentioned, the number five is completed by light. In the Kāṇva recension of the B.U. there is no mention of food.

In place of food, light should be included.

The Kāṇva recension does not read अन्न so as to make up the number five, we should understand ज्योतिस् in place of अन्न, so that पञ्चजन remains unaffected.

Kāraṇatvādhikaraṇam (1-4-14 to 15)

(1) कारणत्वेन चाकाशादिषु यथाव्यपदिष्टोक्तेः। (1-4-14)

(ii) समाकर्षात्। (1-4-15) The consideration of apparently conflicting passages which deal with creation, varying order of creation from passage to passage is taken up here in this adhikaraṇa. आत्मनः आकाशः सम्भूतः। (T.U. 2-1) state that space arose from the self तत् तेजोऽसृजत। (C.U. 6-2-3) It created fire. स प्राणमसृजत प्राणाच्छ्रद्धाम्। (P.U. 6-4) the person created breath and from breath faith. All these passages are conflicting regarding the creation. But it has been pointed out by the sūtrakāra in the sūtra कारणत्वेन चाकाशदिषु यथा व्यपदिष्टोक्तेः। (1-4-14) (Although there is a conflict of the Vedānta passages with regard to the things created such as) ether and so on, (that there is no such conflict with regard to the Lord) being the creator on account of this being represented (in one passage) as described (in other passages) viz. as the cause (of the world).

Vedānta passages may be conflicting with regards to the order of the things created, such as, ether and so on, they do not conflict with regard to the creator. सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म। Truth, knowledge and infinite is Brahman. This Brahman is always represented as the cause and hence pradhāna cannot be the cause of the world, on account of the conflicting passages regarding creation.

Moreover, conflict regarding the order of creation will be taken up later on in 2-3.

The second sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is समाकर्षात्। (1-4-15) on account of the connection. असद्वा इदमग्र आसीत्। (T.U. 2-7) Ah, this, verily was in the beginning non-being. This does not mean absolute nonexistence. If sat indicates the being of Brahman, with all the manifest names and forms Asat indicates the being of Brahman without names and forms. It indicates the condition of the world prior to its manifestation.

Similarly the passage असदेवेदमग्र आसीत्। (C.U. 3-19-1) is also connected with another passage तत्सदासीत्। (C.U. 3-19-1) It was being.

This cannot be in the case of Pradhāna. तदेदं तर्ह्यव्याकृतमासीत्। (B.U. 1-4-7) How this was then undeveloped. This cannot refer to the pradhāna because the undeveloped one Brahman as stated there only तन्नामरूपाभ्यां व्याक्रियत। (B.U. 1-4-7) It evolved with name and form. This points out to Brahman and not to pradhāna.

It may be noted that, in the present adhikaraṇa too, the sūtrakāra continues to refute the Sāṁkhya claim that it is based upon the śruti.

Bālākyadhikaraṇam (1-4-16 to 18)

According to the school of Śaṅkara, this is called, Bālākyadhikaraṇa, obiviously named after the dialogue between Bālāki and Ajātaśatru. However, this name has not been adopted by other schools of Vedānta.

According to the school of Rāmānuja this is Jagadvācitvādhikaraṇa after the wording of the sūtra जगद्वाचित्वात्। (1-4-16). This name has been adopted by other schools also. However, for Madhava, the the arrangement of the adhikaraṇa is different from the rest of the commentators, He regards the adhikaraṇa as beginning with the previous sūtra समाकर्षात्। (1-4-15) and as ending with the sūtra अवस्थितेरिति काशकृत्स्नः। (1-4-22) He differs from the other commentators in interpreting the sūtras from the Karmakāṇḍa point of view, which as pointed out in the previous adhikaraṇa does not seem to be tenable looking to the trend of the discussion in the Brahmasūtras.

This adhikaraṇa has the following three sūtras via.

(i) जगद्वाचित्वात्। (1-4-16)

(ii) जीवमुख्यप्राणलिङ्गान्नेति चेत्तद्वयाख्यातम्। (1-4-17)

(iii) अन्यार्थं तु जैमिनि: प्रश्नव्याख्यानाभ्यामपि चैवमेके। (1-4-16)

The first sūtra is जगद्वाचित्वात्। (1-4-16) (He whose work is this Brahman) because (the 'work') denotes the world. The sūtra has the passage यो वै बालाक एतेषां पुरुषाणां कर्ता यस्य वैतत्कर्म स वै वेदितव्य:। (Kau. Brāhmaṇa U. 4-19) He, verily, O Bālāka, who is the maker of these persons (whom you have mentioned in succession). He of whom, all this is the work, He alone is to be known.

How what is to be known, the individual soul or the chief vital breath or the Highest self? Prāṇa or the individual soul cannot be the objects of knowledge. Bālāki begins his conversation with Ajātaśatru with the proposal ब्रह्म ते ब्रवाणीति। (Kau. Brāhmaṇa U. 4-1) Let me declare, Brahman to you, Then he mentions one by one the person who is in the sun, the person who is in the moon, the person who is in the lightning, the person who is in the thunder, the person who is in the air, the person who is in space, the person who is in fire, the person who is in mirror, the person who is in the shadow, the person who is in the echo, the person who is in sound, the person who while asleep about in a dream, the person who is in the body, the person who is in the right eye, and the person who is in the left eye. Then Bālāki became silent. At this juncture, Ajātaśatru asked

एतावन्नु बालाका इत्येतावद्धीति होवाच बालाकिस्तं होवाचाजातशत्रुर्मृषा वै किल मा समवादयिष्ठा ब्रह्म ते ब्रवाणीति।

'Thus for only (do you know) O Bālāki'? 'Thus far only' replied Bālāki. To him then Ajātaśatru said, 'In vain, indeed did you make me to converse saying, 'Let me declare Brahman to you'

So then Ajātśatru utters the sentence referred to above i.e. यो वै बालाक एतेषां पुरुषाणां कर्ता यस्य वैतत्कर्म स वेदितव्य इति।

He verily O Bālāki, who is the maker of these persons (whom you have mentioned in succession), he of whom all this is the work, he alone is to be known.

If there is any doubt regarding the Kau. Brāhmaṇa U. passage being the v.v., then the next sūtra removes it! The second sūtra is जीवमुख्यप्राणलिङ्गान्नेति चेत्तद्वयाख्यातम्। (1-4-17) If it be said that this is not so on account of the characteristic marks of the individual soul and the chief vital breath, (we reply that) that has already been explained.

The passage does contain the characteristic marks of the individual soul, and the chief vital breath, but considering the opening and the concluding clauses, Brahman is the principal topic. It begins with ब्रह्म ते ब्रवाणीति। The conclusion refers to the reward which relates itself to meditation on Brahman तथो एवैवं विद्वान्सर्वान्पाप्मनोऽपर हत्य सर्वेषां भूतानां श्रेष्ठयं स्वाराज्यमाधिपत्यं पर्येति य एवं वेद य एवं वेद।

He who knows thus, striking off all evils, attains preeminence sovereignity and overlordship over all beings.

And that mukhya prāṇa or Jīva could not be meant has already been shown in जीवमुख्यप्राणलिङ्गान्नेति चेन्नोपासात्रैविध्यादाश्रितत्वादिह तद्योगात्। (1-1-51) If it is said that Brahman is not meant because the characteristic marks of the individual soul and the chief breath are mentioned, we say no, because, in this interpretation three types of devotion would result (from your interpretation); on account of (characteristic marks of Brahman) being connected (with the passage under discussion).

The third sūtra is अन्यार्थं तुं जैमिनिः प्रश्नव्याख्यानाभ्यामपि चैवमेके। (1-4-18) But Jaimini thinks that the reference to the individual soul has another purpose, on account of the question and answer, and thus some also (read in their text).

Even assuming that there is a reference to the individual soul, it is only to intimate about Brahman. This is clear from the nature of the question and the explanatory answer given in this connection. When Ajātaśatru asked as to where the person was asleep and when he came back to the waking state क्वैष एतद्बालाके पुरुषोऽशयिष्ट क्व वा एतदभूत्कुत एतदागात्। (Kau. Brāhmaṇa U. 4-19) Where, in this case, O Bālāki, this person has lain, what has become of him here? from where has he returned here?

The reply is यदा सुप्तः न कंचन पश्यत्यथास्मिन्प्राण एवैकधा भवति। when sleeping, he sees no dream, then he becomes one with that prāṇa alone, Further, एतस्मादात्मनः प्राणा यथायतनं विप्रतिष्ठन्ते प्राणेभ्यो देवा देवेभ्यो लोकाः। (Kau. Brāhmaṇa U. 4-20)

From this self alone, that the prāṇas depart to their abode, and from prāṇa depart gods and from gods the beings.

It is the general Vedānta doctrine that at the time of deep sleep, the soul becomes one with the Highest Brahman and that,

from the highest Brahman, the whole world proceeds, inclusive of prāṇa and so on.

In the B.U. which also refers to the dialogue between Ajātaśatru and Bālāki some read य एष विज्ञानमयः पुरुषः क्वैष तदाभूत कुत एतदागात्। (B.U. 2-1-16)

When this person who consists of intelligence, fell asleep , thus where was it, and whence did it come back? The answer is य एषोऽन्तर्हृदय आकाशस्तस्मिन् शेते। (B.U. 2-1-17) He rests in the space within the heart. Now we know that आकाश is used to denote the highest self, as in दहरोऽस्मिन्नन्तराकाशः। (C.U. 8-1-1)

Thus the doctrine conveyed by the rousing of the sleeping person viz. that the individual soul is different from the vital air furnishes a further argument against the opinion that the passage refers to the vital air.

Vākyānvayādhikaraṇam (1-4-19 to 22)

The adhikaraṇa comprises the folowing four sūtras viz.

(i) वाक्यान्वयात्। (1-4-19)

(ii) प्रतिज्ञासिद्धेर्लिङ्गमाश्मरथ्यः। (1-4-20)

(iii) उत्क्रमिष्यत एवंभावादित्यौडुलोमिः। (1 -4-21)

(iv) अवस्थितेरिति काशकृत्स्नः।

The first sūtra is वाक्यान्वयात्। (1-4-19) On account of the connection between sentences (the self to be seen, heard etc. is the Highest self. The v.v. of the sūtra and the adhikaraṇa is from the B.U. न वा अरे पत्युः कामाय पतिः प्रियः भवति आत्मनस्तु कामाय पतिः प्रियः भवति।... न वा अरे सर्वस्य कामाय सर्वं प्रियं भवत्यात्मनस्तु कामाय सर्वं प्रियं भवत्यात्मा वा अरे सर्वस्य कामाय सर्वं प्रियं भवत्यात्मनस्तु कामाय सर्वं प्रियं भवत्यात्मा वा अरे द्रष्टव्यः श्रोतव्यो मन्तव्यो निदिध्यासितव्यो मैत्रेय्यात्मनो वा अरे दर्शनेन श्रवणेन मत्या विज्ञानेन सर्वं विदितम्। (B.U. 4-5-6)

Verily, a husband is not dear for the sake of husband but for the sake of the self is the husband dear....verily, not for the sake of all is all dear, but for the sake of the self is all dear. Verily, O Maitreyi, the self is to be seen, to be heard, be reflected on, to be meditated upon. When verily, the self is seen, heard, reflected on and known, then all is known.

The doubt arises whether the self to be seen, heard etc. is the individual soul, or the Highest Self. The answer provided by the sūtrakāra is that the passage has a reference to the highest self on

account of the mutual connection between the passages. In the opening of the passage Maitreyi wishes to know that by which she can be immortal, and Yājñavalkya answers that, by the knowledge of the Highest Self, she can be immortal. In the subsequent passages it is also said ब्रह्म तं परादाद्योऽन्यत्रात्मनो ब्रह्म वेद। (B.U.4-5-7)

Brahman deserts him who knows Brahmanhood in anything else than the self. It is also stated that everything is the self. Yājñavalkya urges that the Highest Self is the cause of the world of names and forms and works. So the context of the whole passage establishes that the reference is to the Highest Self.

The next sūtra is प्रतिज्ञासिद्धेर्लिङ्गमाश्मरथ्यः। (1-4-20)

The reference to the individual soul as an object to be seen, heard etc. indicates the proof of the fulfilment of the statement, so thinks Āśmarathya. The circumstances of the soul being represented as the object of sight indicates the fulfilment of the promissory statement आत्मनि विज्ञाते सर्वमिदं विज्ञातं भवति is the प्रतिज्ञा and लिङ्गम् is आत्मा वा अरे द्रष्टव्यो श्रोतव्यो मन्तव्यो निदिध्यासितव्यो इति। (B.U. 4-5-6) If the individual soul were different from the Highest Self, then the knowledge of the latter will not comprehand the knowledge of the former and thus the statement that through the knowledge of the one thing, everything will be known would not be fulfilled. The statement implies that the individual soul and the Highest Self are not different

The third sūtra is उत्क्रमिष्यत एवं भावादित्यौडुलोमिः। (1-4-21) The initial statement identifies the individual soul and the Highest Self, because the soul when it will depart (from the body) is such (i.e. one with the Highest Self), thus, Auḍulomi thinks. Auḍulomi seems to be thinking that the soul is different from Brahman upto the time of its final release. It is in view of the future condition that is acquired by the individual soul that it is described as non-different from the Highest Self.

And the passage Auḍulomi would be referring to is this

एष सम्प्रसादोऽस्माच्छरीरात्समुत्थाय परं ज्योतिरुपसंपद्य स्वेन रूपेणाभिनिष्पद्यते। (C.U. 8-12-3) The serene one when he rises from this body and reaches the highest light, appears in his own form.

The last sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is अवस्थितेरिति काशकृत्स्नः। (1-4-22) The initial statement is made because (the Highest self) exists in the condition (of the individual soul) so Kāśakṛtsna thinks.

Kāśakṛtsna holds that the soul is absolutely non-different from Brahman which somehow presents itself as the individual soul. Kāśakṛtsna's v.v. would be अनेन जीवेनात्मनानुप्रविश्य नामरूपे व्याकरवाणि। (C.U. 6-3-2) let me enter into them with this living self and evolve name and form.

Prakṛtyadhikaraṇa (1-4-24 to 27)

The Adhikaraṇa consists of the following five sūtras :

(i) प्रकृतिश्च प्रतिज्ञादृष्टान्तानुपरोधात्। (1-4-23)

(ii) अभिध्योपदेशाच्च। (1-4-24)

(iii) साक्षाच्चोभयाम्नात्। (1-4-25)

(iv) आत्मकृतेः परिणामात्। (1-4-26)

(v) योनिश्च हि गीयते। (1-4-27)

This adhikaraṇa seeks to establish Brahman as the Upādāna kāraṇa or the material cause of the world. The first sūtra is प्रकृतिश्च प्रतिज्ञादृष्टान्तानुपरोधात्। (1-4-23) Brahman is the material cause also, on account of this view not being in conflict with the promissory statements and the illustrative instances. The sūtra obviously has reference to a passage which contains a promissory statement and illustrations in support of the pratijñā. This is the passage from the C.U. येनाश्रुतं श्रुतं भवत्यमतं मतमविज्ञातं विज्ञातं भवति। (C.U. 6-1-) By which the unhearable becomes heard, the unperceivable becomes perceived, the unknowable becomes known. This is the initial statement. Then the illustrations of clay, iron, gold etc. are given.

Just as my dear, by one clod of clay, all that is made of clay becomes known, the modifications being only a name arising from speech while the truth is that it is just clay.

This and other illustrations establish Brahman as the material cause of the world. Moreover, it is implied in the sūtra as well as in the passage cited that Brahman is both the material and efficient cause of the world. While in the case of clay or gold, an efficient, cause like the potter or the goldsmith is required for transforming clay or gold into vessels, ornaments, no other efficient cause of the world is possible than Brahman. If that were not the case the initial statement and the illustrations would

become false. The knowledge of everything else would not follow from the knowledge of one thing. So Brahman is both the efficient and the material cause of the world.

The second sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is अभिध्योपदेशाच्च। (1-4-24) And because the statement of desire on the part of the self. There are passages which show volition on the part of Brahman. तदैक्षत बहु स्यां प्रजायेय। (C.U. 6-25). He thought, may I be many, may I grow forth. सोऽकामयत बहु स्यां प्रजायेय। (T.U. 2-6)

He desired may I be many, may I grow forth. These passages show that Brahman is the efficient as well as the material cause of the world.

The word अभिध्या means 'desire' or 'reflection' something indicating a volitional effort at the mental level. Of course अमरकोश gives the meaning as अभिध्या तु परस्य विषये स्पृहा। (Amarakośa 1-7-24) Śaṅkara takes अभिध्या as अभिध्यान in the sense of reflection.

The third sūtra is साक्षाच्चोभयाम्नात्। (1-4-25) And on account of both (i.e. the origin and dissolution of the world) being directly declared to have Brahman for their material cause. Brahman is stated in the śruti as the material cause of the world as that, from which the world comes into being and in which it is withdrawn. सर्वाणि ह वा इमानि भूतान्याकाशादेव समुत्पद्यन्ते। आकाशं प्रत्यस्तं यन्ति। (C.U. 1-9-1)

For all these creatures are produced from space. They return back into space.

The sūtra also may be interpreted as 'And an account of (Brahman being) both (the material and effecient causes) directly declared.' And this interpretation is more logical.

Rāmānuja explains the sūtra in this way. He quotes from the Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa.

किं स्विद्वनं क उ स वृक्ष आसीद्यतो द्यावापृथिवी निष्टतक्षुः।
मनीषिणो मनसा पृच्छतेदुतद्यदुध्यतिष्ठद्भुवनानि धारयन्॥
ब्रह्म वनं ब्रह्म स वृक्ष आसीद्यतसे द्यावापृथिवी निष्टतक्षुः।
मनीषिणो मनसा विब्रवीमि वो ब्रह्माध्यतिष्ठद् भुवनानि धारयन्।।

(Taitt.Brā. 2-8-9)

What possibly wood, what possibly the tree, verily was that from which they fashioned out the heaven and the earth?

O wise men ask in your mind about that, which stood supporting the worlds.

Brahman the wood, Brahman the tree, was (there) from which they fashioned out the heaven and earth; O wise men

I speak out to you (thinking in the mind), Brahman stood there supporting the worlds.

The next sūtra is आत्मकृतेः परिणामात्। (1.4.26) (Brahman is the material cause) on account of (the self) making itself, (which is possible) owing to modification.

Brahman is the material cause for that reason also that scripture represents the self as the object of modification as well as the agent. This sūtra obviously refers to the passage तदात्मनं स्वयमकुरुत। (T.U. 2-7) That itself transformed itself by self. Even as the clay is changed into its effects, the self gets itself transformed into the things of the world.

Rāmānuja reads परिणामात् as a separate sūtra. The last sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is योनिश्च हि गीयते। (1-4-27) And because Brahman is declared as the source. Brahman is described as the source of all beings. भूतयोनि (M.U. 1-1-6) ब्रह्मयोनि (M.U. 3-1-3)

Sarvavyākhyānādhikaraṇam (1-4-28) This is a one-sūtra adhikaraṇa. The sūtra is एतेन सर्वे व्याख्याताः व्याख्याताः। (1-4-28) Hereby all (the words and views referring to Brahman) are explained, explained.

Śaṅkara explains एतेन सर्वे in the last sūtra to mean अण्वादिकारणवादाः and adds that pradhānakāraṇavāda has been given much attention and others are said to have been refuted by the arguments advanced against Pradhānakāraṇavāda.

CHAPTER - 6

THE VIṢAYAVĀKYAS IN THE FIRST, THIRD AND THE FOURTH PĀDAS OF THE AVIRODHĀDHYĀYA

If the first adhyāya dealt with the harmony of texts dealing with the Highest Reality, the second adhyāya traditionally designated as the Avirodhādhyāya deals with non-contradiction. Śaṅkara describes the contents of the second chapter thus; इदानीं स्वपक्षे स्मृतिन्यायविरोधपरिहार: प्रधानादिवादिनां च न्यायाभासोपबृंहितत्वं प्रतिवेदान्तं च सृष्ट्यादिप्रक्रियाया अविगीतत्वमित्यस्यार्थजातस्य प्रतिपादनाय द्वितीयोऽध्याय आरभ्यते।

The purport of the second adhyāya is to refute the objections (to the doctrine established hitherto), which might be founded on smṛti and reasoning and to show that the doctrines of the pradhāna etc. have only fallacious arguments to lean upon and that the different Vedānta texts do not contradict one another with regard to the mode of creation and similar topics.[1]

Rāmānuja writes

प्रथमेऽध्याये प्रत्यक्षादिप्रमाणगोचरादचेतनात्तत्संसृष्टात्तद्वियुक्ताच्च चेतनादर्थान्तरभूते निरस्तनिखिलाविद्याद्यपुरुषार्थगन्धमनन्तज्ञानानन्दैकतानमपरिमितोदारगुणसागरं निखिलजगदेककारणं सर्वान्तरात्मभूतं परं ब्रह्म वेदान्तवेद्यमित्युक्तम्। अनन्तरमस्यार्थस्य सम्भावनीयसमस्तप्रकारदुर्धर्षणत्वप्रतिपादनाय द्वितीयोऽध्याय आरभ्यते।

The first adhyāya has established the truth that what the Vedānta texts teach is Supreme Brahman which is something different from nonsentient matter known through the ordinary means of proof viz. perception and so on, from the intelligent souls whether connected with or separated from matter, which is free from even a shadow of imperfection of any kind, which is an ocean as it were of auspicious qualities and so on, which is the sole cause of the entire universe, which constitutes the inner self of all things. The second adhyāya is now begun for the purpose of proving that the view thus set forth cannot be impugned by whatever arguments that may possibly be brought forward.[2]

Bhāskara almost echoes the words of Śaṅkara:

---

1. Tr. Thibaut George. The Vedānta Sūtras, part I, p. 291
2. Ibid., part III p.478

प्रथमेऽध्याये सर्वज्ञं सर्वशक्तिब्रह्म जगतः कारणमिति प्रतिपादितम्। स्मृतिन्यायविरोधपरिहारः परदर्शनानां च तर्काभासविजृम्भितत्वं सृष्टिश्रुतिनां परस्परं विप्रतिपत्तिसमाधानमित्यस्यार्थजातस्य प्रतिपादनार्थं द्वितीयोऽध्याय आरभ्यते।[1]

In the first chapter the omniscient and omnipresent Brahman was established as the cause of the world. The second adhyāya is begun with a view to establishing the topics viz. removing the contradiction by smṛti and logic, bloatedness of the fallacious reasoning by the other systems of philosophy and reconciliation of the alleged contradiction of the smṛti passages dealing with the creation.

Madhva writes उक्तेऽर्थेऽविरोधं दर्शयत्यनेनाध्यायेन। In this chapter, noncontradiction is being established in the said meaning.

Vallábha writes प्रथमाध्याये वेदान्तवाक्यानां विवादास्पदानां ब्रह्मपरत्वेन समन्वयः प्रतिपादितः। अधुना श्रुतिस्मृत्यविरोधः प्रतिपाद्यते।

In the first chapter conciliation of the controversial Vedānta passages was established by showing them to be dealing with Brahman. Now it is being shown that there is no opposition from śruti and smṛti.

It may be noted at the very outset, before we take up the individual adhikáraṇas and the sūtras for consideration from the viṣayavākya point-of-view that, the Brahmasūtra displays two kinds of attitudes to the philosophical deliberations. One is that of a hermeneutic scholar and the other is that of the apologist. (The hermeneutic scholar considers the meaning of certain sections of the Upaniṣads or of the complete scriputre. That was done in the first adhyāya and we also did it in great details taking up each and every sūtra. That was also very essential as the first adhyāya is perhaps the most important chapter of the Brahmasūtra as the whole of the Brahmasūtra purports 'to accomplish summarizing and systematizing the teaching of revelation and in particular the Upaniṣads'.[2] This objective was sought to be established in the first adhyāya, and admirably accomplished. That was done through the hermeneutical approach.

---

1. ब्रह्मसूत्रभाष्यम्— श्रीभास्कराचार्यविरचितम् ed. Pandit Vindhyeshwari Prasada Dvivedin, p. 87
2. George C. Adams, Jr., Bādarāyaṇa's Brahma Sūtras, p. 1

Perhaps Bādarāyaṇa also meant the first adhyāya to be the most important in the Brahmasūtra as indicated in the last sūtra of the first adhyāya एतेन सर्वा व्याख्याता: व्याख्याता: ।

Here all (the words and views referring to Brahman) are explained. He (Bādarāyaṇa) perhaps means to say that in the first adhyāya a method of explaining the Vedic and particularly Upaniṣadic passages has been enunciated (and that was the most important thing to do for a system of philosophy which heavily leans upon the śruti).

The other approach is that of the apologist who defends the school's standpoint and criticises the opponent's arguments... Since each sūtra of the Brahmasūtra is expounded against those who hold opposing views, the whole sūtra (i.e. the Brahmasūtra) may be regarded as a record of apologetics or disputations. However, the majority are concerned with conflicting views on the scriptures and are not purely philosophical problems. Part II (i.e. a second adhyāya) chapters 1 and 2 (i.e. pāda) which criticizes the views of other schools, should be considered as purely philosophical disputation.[1] So pāda 1 and 2 of the second adhyāya deal mainly with the philosophical disputation, they are not that much important from the viṣayavākya point of view, as the preceeding adhyāya.[2]

Without entering into the intricate question of the original Brahmasūtra and later overhaulings as S.K. Belvalkar would call them[3] and according to him the Smṛtipāda and Tarkapāda are later accretions, we may state that, these two pādas (2-1,2) have least to do with the viṣayavākyas as such and so we may very well omit them without damaging the overall design of the

---

1. Hajime Nakamura, A History of Early Vedānta Philosophy, p. 480, 481
2. Referring to the fivefold division of the adhikaraṇa, Belvalkar writes, 'In theory every adhikaraṇa ought to be capable of being presented in this fivefold division, although the best illustrative examples of them occur in the first adhyāya (and in portions of the third and the fourth) where the question is that of mīmāṁsā or exact interpretation of a given Vedic text, open to divergent interpretations. The Brahmasūtras of Bādarāyaṇa, Chapter II, Quarters I & II, 1931, Notes p. 4.
3. Vide infra chapter I discussing this problem.

present thesis. Further whenever, the smṛtipāda has some connection with some śruti passage, it is not at all problematic and so we need not go into it. To illustrate, Ārambhaṇādhikaraṇa (2-1-14 to 20) has the passage from the C.U. (6-1-4) यथा सोम्यैकेन मृत्पिण्डेन सर्वं मृन्मयं विज्ञातं स्याद्वाचारम्भणं विकारो नामधेयं मृत्तिकेत्येव सत्यम्। as the v.v. and which can be regarded as one of the surest v.v.s of any adhikaraṇa or sūtra as the word ārambhaṇa from the śruti passage has been incorporated in the sūtra i.e. तदनन्यत्वमारम्भणशब्दादिभ्यः। (2-1-14) itself.

Moreover though the adhikaraṇa has a śruti passage as the v.v., the conduct of the adhikaraṇa is more dependent upon logic or न्याय as commentators would call it, rather than the śruti authority. Whenever, a śruticitation is resorted to, it is to strengthen the reasoning. This attitude singles these two pādas out from the rest of the Brahmasūtra. In the first pāda also this स्मृतिन्यायविरोधपरिहारः is observable and as S.K. Belvalkar opines the smṛtivirodha occupying sūtras 1-3 and perhaps sūtra 12 also, the nyāyavirodha being answered in the rest of the sūtras.[1] While following Belvalkar, we may further prune down the first pāda and deal with the first adhikaraṇa only and the second pada be entirely omitted.

Smṛtyadhikaraṇam (2-1-1 to 2)

The first adhikaraṇa of the first pāda of the second adhyāya has the following sūtras :

(i) स्मृत्यनवकाशदोषप्रसङ्ग इति चेन्नान्यस्मृत्यनवकाशदोष प्रसङ्गात्। (2-1-1)

(ii) इतरेषां चानुपलब्धेः। (2-1-2)

The first sūtra is स्मृत्यनवकाशदोषप्रसङ्ग इति चेन्नान्यस्मृत्यनवकाश-दोषप्रसङ्गात्। (2-1-1) if it be said that there will result the defect of not allowing room for certain smṛtis (we say) not so, because there will result the defect of not allowing room for some other smṛtis.

As we saw in the first chapter it was established that the omniscient Lord of all is the material and efficient cause of the universe. The Sāṁkhya view that Pradhāna is the cause of the universe was shown to be lacking in spiritual authority. Now in

1. The Brahmasūtras of Bādarāyaṇa Chapter II, Quarters I & II, B. Notes p. 6

the first pāda of the second chapter it is sought to be shown that there is no contradiction between the conclusions of the first chapter and the statements of certain smṛtis. With the first sūtra of the first pāda, this topic is taken up.

Pūrvapakṣa again raises an objection or as Bhāskara says अत्र सांख्या: प्रत्यवतिष्ठन्ते। The oppenent argues that according to Kapila's Sāṁkhya smṛti, pradhāna is the cause of the universe. Now in the previous adhyāya it was pointed out that smṛti makes out Brahman as the cause of the universe. So now such smrtis would have no applicability and hence, they would be useless. They are also not like Manusmṛti which deals with the duties and rules of life over and above the cause of the world nature of soul etc. and hence smṛtis like Sāṁkhya would be rendered irrelevant. So in order not to render the Sāṁkhya smṛtis and like irrelevant, we must explain the Vedānta texts in such a manner as not to bring them into conflict with such smṛtis. Moreover, these smṛtis are composed by celebrated authorities like Kapila whom the smṛtis also hold in high respect.

These objections are rebutted by the siddhāntin in the following way. If this argument of the pūrvapakṣa is upheld, then some other smṛtis would be rendered irrelevant.

Bhagavadgīta says अहं कृत्स्नस्य जगत: प्रभव: प्रलयस्तथा। (B.G. 7/6) I am the orgin and the place of reabsorpiton of the whole world.

Āpastamba says तस्मात्काया: प्रभवन्ति सर्वे स मूलं शाश्वतिक: स नित्य:। (Dharma sūtra 1-8-23-2) From him spring all bodies, he is the primary cause, he is eternal, he is unchangeable.

So these smṛtis which declare Brahman to be the efficient as well as the material cause of the world, would be rendered purposelgss.

Moreover, if Kapila is a perfect man, then there are many other perfect men whose smṛtis contradict each other.

And hence, finally an appeal will have to be made to śruti only.

If a smṛti passage has spoken highly of Kapila, then, a similar smṛti passage has spoken highly of Manu also, whose smṛti holds Brahman to be the cause of the world. So if the system of Kapila contradicts the Veda, then, such smṛti is to be disregarded.

The second sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is (1-2-2) And on account of nonapprehension of others. The previous sūtra tried to prove that the smṛti has to be interpreted in the light of Sāṁkhya smṛtis. This sūtra says that terms like avyakta puruṣa etc. may be interpreted as referring to Prakṛti and Puruṣa of the Sāṁkhya, but we do not find categories like mahat, of the Sāṁkhya mentioned in the śrutis. If it be said that Kaṭha U. (1-3-11) mentions mahat the great and avyakta, the unmanifested in 1-4-1, it has been explained that these refer to the intellect and body of Hiraṇyagarbha and not to Mahat and Pradhāna of the Sāṁkhya. If Kapilasmṛti cannot be trusted in the treatment of the effects, it follows that it cannot be trusted in the treatment of cause also i.e. Pradhāna.

As we noted in the introduction to this chapter, second pāda also will be omitted from our consideration as it has resorted to reasoning युक्ति independent of the श्रुतिवाक्यनिरपेक्ष: as Śaṅkara would put it. Hence it will not have any scope for the v.v. As the current name of the second pāda i.e. तर्कपाद indicates it is refuting the rival theories on the basis of the logic.

So now we turn to 2-3. According to the commentators this pāda takes up the question of resolving the apparent contradictions of the śruti passages dealing with the creation process. Śaṅkara's preface to his commentary to the third pāda of the second adhyāya is fairly representative of the view of most of the commentators. He says

वेदान्तेषु तत्र तत्र भिन्नप्रस्थाना उत्पत्तिश्रुतय उपलभ्यन्ते। केचिदाकाशस्योत्पत्तिमामनन्ति केचिन्न। तथा केचिद्वाचोरूत्पत्तिमानन्ति केचिन्न। एवं जीवस्य प्राणानां च। एवमेव क्रमादिद्वारकोऽपि विप्रतिषेध: श्रुत्यन्तरेषूपलक्ष्यते। विप्रतिषेधाच्च परपक्षाणामनपेक्षित्वं स्थापितं तद्वत्स्वपक्षस्यापि विप्रतिषेधादेवानपेक्षित्वमाशऽङ्क्येतेत्यत: सर्ववेदान्तगतसृष्टिश्रुत्यर्थे निर्मलत्वाय पर: प्रपञ्च आरभ्यते।

In the Vedānta texts we meet in different places with different statements concerning the origination of various things. Some of those passages declare that ether originated, some do not. Some record the origination of air, others do not. Other passages again make analogous statements concerning the individual soul and the vital airs. Similarly we observe that other scriptural texts contradict one another concerning the order of

succession and the like. Now, as we ourselves have inferred the worthlessness of other philosophical doctrines from their mutual contradictions, a suspicion might arise that our doctrine is equally worthless owing to its intrinsic contradictions. Hence a new discussion is begun in order to clear doubts about the sense of all those Vedānta texts which refer to creation and thus remove the suspicion alluded to.[1]

The next several sūtras take up the question of the genesis of the five primordial elements. These.sūtras should not present any difficulty by and large, as far as the v.vs. are concerned. We may discuss the first adhikaraṇa in some detail, to have an idea of the nature of discussion and not to break the symmetary in the design, so abruptly.

Viyadadhikaraṇam (2-3-1 to 7)

The first adhikaraṇa of the third pāda of the second adhyāya has the following seven sūtras :

(i) न वियदश्रुतेः। (2.3.1)

(ii) अस्ति तु। (2.3.2)

(iii) गौण्यसंभवाच्च। (2.3.3)

(iv) शब्दाच्च। (2.3. 4)

(v) स्याच्चैकस्य ब्रह्मशब्दवत्। (2.3.5)

(vi) प्रतिज्ञाहानिरव्यतिरेकाच्छब्देभ्यः। (2.3.6)

(vii) यावद्विकारं तु विभागो लोकवत्। (2.3.7)

Rāmānuja's arrangement of the adhikaraṇa is different. According to him, the first adhikaraṇa continues upto nine sūtras. He does not recognise a separate adhikaraṇa for the eithth sūtra dealing with the genesis of air, and the ninth sūtra is concluding sūtra according to him. If we take into account the fact that the sūtrakāra has taken up the consideration of the genesis of the five elements then it would be legitimate that each of the five elements be assigned a separate adhikaraṇa. Of course, to be fair to Rāmānuja his Tejodhikaraṇa starting from the sūtra ten extends upto seventeen and he does not assign separate adhikaraṇas to the elements as the other commentators have done. The arrangement

1. Translation by Thibaut, The Vedānta Sūtras with the commentary by Śaṅkarācārya part II.

by Śaṅkara has the advantage of being simple, lucid and consistent.

Madhva, Nimbārka and Vallabha constitute the adhikaraṇa like that of Śaṅkara.

This adhikaraṇa considers the genesis of Ākāśa. The first sūtra is न वियदश्रुते: । (2-3-1) Ākāśa does not originate on account of there being no śruti. In the C.U. it is stated

तदैक्षत। बहुस्यां प्रजायेयेति। तत्तेजो सृजत। तत्तेज ऐक्षत। बहुं स्यां प्रजायेयेति। तदपो सृजत।... ता आप ऐक्षन्त। बह्व्यः स्याम प्रजायेमहीति। ता अन्नमसृजन्त। (C.U. 6-2-3). It thought, May I be many, may I grow forth. It sent for the fire. That fire thought May I be many, may I grow forth. It sent forth water. That water thought, may I be many, may I grow forth. It sent forth food.

In this passage, fire, water and earth are mentioned as produced but ākāśa is not mentioned as produced. The sūtra presents a primafacie view that the ākāśa is not originated and hence is co-eternal with Brahman.

The second sūtra is अस्ति तु। (2-3-2) But there is a scriptural statement regarding the origination of akāśa. The T.U. says तस्माद्वा एतस्मादात्मन: आकाश: सम्भूत: । (T.U. 2-1) From this self indeed ākāśa arose. So this is the v.v. of the sūtra.

So it is not correct to say that the ākāśa is not mentioned as produced in the śruti.

The third sūtra is गौण्यसंभवात्। (2-3-3) The scriptural statement concerning the origination of ākāśa has a secondary sense, on account of the impossibility of the origination of ākāśa. The text dealing with the genesis of ākāśa is not to be taken literally but, only in a secondary sense, because the creation of ākāśa which is partless and all-pervading is an impossibility. Obviously in the sūtra, the above quoted (T.U. 2-1) passage is being considered.

The fourth sūtra is शब्दाच्च। (2-3-4) And on account of the text. The text is वायुश्चान्तरिक्षं चैतदमृतम्। (B.U. 2-3-3). The text declares the ākāśa, along with air to be eternal.

The fifth sūtra is स्याच्चैकस्य ब्रह्मशब्दवत्। (2-3-5) The one word 'sprang' may be taken in its secondary as well as in its primary sense like the word Brahman, if we accept the origination as being secondary in the case, of ākāśa, then an anomaly arises. In

respect of ākāśa, the expression सम्भूत: would have to be taken in a secondary sense and in the case of fire and others, the word सम्भूत: would have to be taken in the primary sense. How is this anomaly to be removed? The पूर्वपक्षिन् seeks to remove it by citing the T.U. passage. Bhṛgu, the son of Varuṇa, approached his father Varuṇa with a request to teach him Brahman. The father asked him to observe austerities. Vāruṇi, gradually came to know Brahman.

भृगुर्वै वारुणि:। वरुणं पितरमुपससार। अधीहि भगवो ब्रह्मेति। तस्मा एतत्प्रोवाच। अन्नं प्राणं चक्षु: श्रोत्रं मनो वाचमिति।... स तपोऽतप्यत। स तपस्तप्त्वा। अन्नं ब्रह्मेति व्याजानात्।... प्राणो ब्रह्मेति व्यजानानात्।...मनो ब्रह्मेति व्याजानात्।... विज्ञानं ब्रह्मेति व्याजानात्।...आनन्दो ब्रह्मेति व्याजानात्। (T.U. 3-2-6)

Bhṛgu the son of Varuṇa, approached his father Varuṇa and said, 'Venerable Sir, teach me Brahman.' 'He explained to him thus : matter, life, sight, hearing, mind, speech...

He performed austerity. He knew that matter is Brahman. (Again Bhṛgu approaches his father with a request to teach him Brahman, observes austerities again. Thus goes on until he knows bliss as Brahman)... He knew that life is Brahman. He knew that intelligence is Brahman.... He knew that bliss is Brahman.

Here the word Brahman is used in the secondary sense with regard to food, mind etc. and in its primary sense with regard to bliss. Hence the same word can be employed in the primary as well as secondary sense in the same context.

Rāmānuja quotes the M.U. in order to explain the two uses of the same word

तपसा चीयते ब्रह्म ततोऽन्नमभिजायते।

अन्नात्प्राणो मन: सत्यं लोका: कर्मसु चामृतम्।।

य: सर्वज्ञ: सर्वविद्यस्य ज्ञानमयं तप:।

तस्मादेतद्ब्रह्म नाम रूपमन्नं च जायते।। (M.U. 1-8,9)

By penance Brahman swells. From that food is produced. From food, life (thence) mind, (thence) real, (thence) worlds, (thence the rituals) and immortality in the rituals.

He who is omniscient, all-wise, whose penance consists of knowledge, from him are born this Brahma, name, shape and food.

Rāmānuja clarifies तस्मादेतब्रह्म नाम रूपमन्नं च जायते,

इत्यत्र प्रधाने गौणतया प्रयुक्तस्तस्मिन्नेव प्रकरणे तपसा चीयते ब्रह्म, ततोऽन्नमभिजायते इति ब्रह्मणि मुख्यतया प्रयुज्यते तद्वत्।

As we are considering the T.U. passage, (see the second sūtra of this adhikaraṇa) it would be proper for us to look for support in the same Upaniṣad rather than go out of it. Hence the T.U. 3-2-6 must have been the v.v. of this sūtra.

The sixth sūtra is प्रतिज्ञा हानिरव्यतिरेकाच्छब्देभ्यः। (2-3-6) The non-abandonment of the promissory statements results only from the non-difference of the entire world, from Brahman, according to the scripture. If the origination of ākāśa is accepted then only there will not be the abandonment of the initial statement in the C.U. येनाश्रुतं श्रुतं भवति, अमतं मतमविज्ञातं विज्ञातमिति। (C.U. 6-1-1) By that, unheard becomes heard, unthought thought, and unknown known. The world is non-different from Brahman. There are many scriptural passages to this effect इदं सर्वं यदयमात्मा। (B.U. 2-4-6). All this is self. ब्रह्मैवेदममृतं पुरस्तात्। (M.U. 2-2-11) Brahman is verily the immortality in front.

The last sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is यावद्विकारं तु विभागो लोकवत्। (2-3-7). But wherever, there are effects, there is distinction as in ordinary life. Whatever is distinguished is an effect, whatever is not an effect is not divisible as the self. Ākāśa is distinguished from earth and so on. Hence it is an effect and hence an origination.

Similarly in the subsequent sūtras (2-3-8, 10, 11, 12) the genesis of air, fire, water, earth, is discussed.

Sūtra 9 असंभवस्तु सतोऽनुपपत्तेः। (2-3-9) says: But there is no origin of sat on account of the impossibility (of such an origin). This sūtra, explains by way of 'digression'[1] as Thibaut would say, that Brahman cannot be originated from anything else.

Tadabhidhyānādhikaraṇam (2-3-13).

This adhikaraṇa too is of one sūtra i.e. तदभिध्यानादेव तु तल्लिङ्गात्सः (12-3-13)

But on account of the indicatory marks supplied by their reflecting (i.e. by the reflection attributed to the elements), He is the creator abiding within the elements.

---

1. Thibaut George, The Vedānta sūtras Vol. I, Introduction, p. ii

Elements are described to be giving rise to their effects आकाशाद्वायुर्वायोरग्निः। (T.U. 2-1) This sūtra maintains that the Supreme residing within these elements produced these effects as brought out by their reflecting, a characteristic which is in fact the sign of the lord's residing in it. Scripture also states यः पृथिव्यां तिष्ठन्यः पृथिव्या अन्तरो यं पृथिवी न वेद यस्य पृथिवी शरीरं यः पृथिवीमन्तरो यमयति। (B.U. 3-7-3) He who dwells in the earth, and within the earth, whom the earth does not know, whose body the earth is, and who rules the earth within. The elements become causes only through the will of the Supreme who resides in them.

Madhva takes this sūtra as referring to the dissolution of the world. To quote B.N.K. Sharma, 'After having resolved the contradiction in respect of the origination of adhibhūta and adhidaiva tattavas, the next adhikaraṇa (i.e. this) removes similar contradiction in respect of the identity of the author of laya'[1] and hence the intended śruti for this sūtra is from the S.U.

क्षरं प्रधानममृताक्षरं हरः,

क्षरात्सानावीक्षते देव एकः।

तस्याभिध्यानाद्योजनात्तत्त्वभावाद्भूयश्चान्ते विश्वमायानिवृत्तिः।। (S.U. 1-10)

What is perishable is the pradhāna. What is immortal and imperishable is Hara. Over both the perishable and the soul the one Lord rules. By meditating on Him, by uniting with Him, by reflecting on his being more and more, there is complete cessation from the illusion of the world.

At the outset it may be stated that this interpretation by Madhva, does not sound natural. However, it has got one advantage : Madhva's interpretation has in view a v.v. which has the word अभिध्यान from the sūtra.

It is obvious that the sūtrakāra is considering the creation of the elements and it would be natural if he takes up a point connected with it about the creation of the elements. Do the elements themselves create their effects or by virtue of some other power? This question has been tackled in this sūtra and the topic of dissolution is to be discussed in the very next adhikaraṇa.

---

1. Sharma B.N.K., Brahmasūtras and their Principal Commentaries Vol. II, p. 170

So the interpretation and hence the v.v. of the adhikaraṇa suggested by Madhva school of thought is not acceptable.

Viparyayādhikaraṇam (2-3-14)

Deals with the order of the dissolution of the elements. As the order of the dissolution has not been specified in any of the śruti passages, no v.v, is meant to be intended here in this adhikaraṇa. Kalpataru, a commentary on the Bhāmatī, clarifies

यद्याप्यत्र श्रुतिविप्रतिषेधो न परिह्रियते तथापि उत्पत्तिक्रमे निरूपिते लयक्रमो बुद्धिस्थो विचार्यते इति प्रासङ्गिक्यौ पादावान्तरसंगती।[1]

Although here, any contradiction among the śrutipassages is not sought to be removed, yet when the order of creation is described, the order of dissolution occurred to the mind and this is being considered. These are occasional consistencies in between the pādas.

The following two sūtras viz.

(i) विज्ञानमनसी क्रमेण तल्लिङ्गादिति चेन्नाविशेषात्। (2-3-15) and

(ii) चराचरव्यपाश्रयस्तु स्यात्तद्व्यपदेशो भाक्तस्तद्भावभावित्वात्। (2-3-16)

continue to deal with some minor points of origination and dissolution.

The next sūtra नात्मा श्रुतेर्नित्यत्वाच्च ताभ्य:। (2-3-17) deals with the question whether the soul is produced.

The sūtrakara says that the self is not produced as there is no scriptural statement and it is eternal according to the scriptural statements which are in abundance. न जीवो म्रियते। (C.U. 6-11-3) The living self dies not.

स वा एष महानज आत्माऽजरोऽमरोऽमृतोऽभयो ब्रह्म। (B.U. 4-4-22). This great unborn self, undecaying, undying, immortal, fearless, is indeed Brahman. न जायते म्रियते वा विपश्चित्। (Kaṭha U. 2-18) The knowing self is not born, it dies not अजो नित्य: शाश्वतोऽयं पुराण:। (Kaṭha U. 2-18). The ancient is unborn, eternal, everlasting, and so on. Thus the scriptural statements proclaim the self to be eternal, which is never in doubt.

Having established the eternity of the soul, the nature of the soul is now being considered upto the end of this pāda. In the following one-sūtra-adhikaraṇa ज्ञोऽत एव (2-3-18), the sūtrakāra

---

1. ब्रह्मसूत्रशाङ्करभाष्यम्, भामतीवेदान्तकल्पतरुपरिमलोपबृंहितम् — p. 597

states that the soul is of the, nature of intelligence for this very reason. Intelligence is the very essence of the jīva and hence it cannot be adventitious as so many śrutis say विज्ञानमानन्दं ब्रह्म। (B.U. 3-9-28) Brahman is knowledge and bliss. सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म। (T.U. 2-1) Brahman is truth, knowledge and infinite. अनन्तरोऽबाह्यः कृत्स्नः प्रज्ञानघन एव। (B.U. 4-5-13) Having neither inside nor outside, but being altogether a mass of knowledge.

Moreover, during the state of deep sleep also, the intelligence does not foresake the soul as the śrutis assert असुप्तः सुप्तानभिचाकशीति। (B.U. 4-3-11). He, not asleep, himself looks at the sleeping न हि विज्ञातुर्विज्ञातेर्विपरिलोक विद्यते। (B.U. 4-3-30). For there is no intermission of the knowing of the knower.

Madhva continues the genesis topic. He writes जीवोऽपि अत एव परमेश्वरादुत्पद्यते शब्दादेव। Now this is out of place here, as it will be difficult to explain why should the sūtrakāra choose the epithet jīva only out of the other available epithets and it would also be difficult to restrict the meaning of jīva to jīva only.[1]

Rāmānuja explains the word सः as ज्ञातस्वरूप. Vallabha explains the word as सश्चैतन्यस्वरूपः।

Utkrāntigatyadhikaraṇam (2-3-19 to 32). The adhikaraṇa consists of as many as the following 14 sūtras viz, (i) उत्क्रान्तिगत्यागतीनाम्। (2-3-19)

(ii) स्वात्मना चोत्तरयोः। (2-3-20)

(iii) नाणुरतच्छ्रुतेरिति चेन्नेतराधिकारात्। (2-3-21)

(iv) स्वशब्दोन्मानाभ्यां च। (2-3-22)

(v) अविरोधश्चन्दनवत्। (2-3-23)

(vi) अवस्थितिवैशेष्यादिति चेन्नोभ्युपगमात् हृदि हि। (2-3-24)

(vii) गुणाद्वा लोकवत्। (2-3-25)

(viii) व्यतिरेको गन्धवत्। (2-3-26)

(ix) तथा च दर्शयति। (2-3-27)

(x) पृथगुपदेशात्। (2-3-28)

(xi) तद्गुणसारत्वात्तु तव्द्यपदेशः प्राज्ञवत्। (2-3-29)

(xii) यावदात्मभावित्वाच्च न दोषस्तद्दर्शनात्। (2-3-30)

(xiii) पुंस्त्वादिवत्त्वस्य सतोऽभिव्यक्तियोगात्। (2-3-31)

---

1. Vide the discussion on this aspect by Belvalkar S.K., Basu Malik Lectures on Vedānta p. 163-164

(xiv) नित्योपलब्ध्यनुपलब्धिप्रसङ्गोऽन्यतरनियमो वाऽन्यथा। (2-3-32)

There is a wide divergence of views regarding the interpretation of these sūtras among the ancient commentators and the modern scholars as well.[1] But, that interpretational divergence, should not detain us here. We shall deal only with the v.v. aspect of these sūtras.

The first sūtra is उत्क्रान्तिगत्यागतीनाम् (2-3-19) On account of the scriptural declarations of the soul's passing out, going and returning, the soul is of atomic size.

The question taken up for consideration is the size of the soul whether it is atomic or mediumsized or of infinite size. The passing out and going and returning these movements are possible only if the soul is of a limited size and that too of atomic size. The movement is impossible in the case of an all-pervading being.

The three types of movements have been mentioned in the sūtra and hence the v.v. should be a such passage or passages which mention all the three movements. In this regard Śaṅkara quotes the passages from the Kau.U. The movement of passing out is mentioned in this passage

स यदास्माच्छरीरादुत्क्रामति सहैवैतैः सर्वैरुत्क्रामति। (Kau.U. 3-3) And when he passes out of this body, he passes out together with all these. The passage describes the movement of passing out. The movement of going is mentioned in the statement from the same Kau. U. ये वै के

चास्माल्लोकात्प्रयन्ति चन्द्रमसमेव ते सर्वे गच्छन्ति। (Kau. 1-2)

All who depart from this world go to the moon. For the movement of returning, Śaṅkara cites a passage from the B.U. viz. तस्मालोकात्पुनरेत्य स्मै लोकाय कर्मणे। (B.U. 4-4-6)

From that world, he returns again to this world of action.

Śaṅkara's v.v.s can be said to have a drawback that they are not from the same Upaniṣad. He draws upon two Upaniṣads viz. Kau.U. and B.U. Kau. U. describes the उत्क्रान्ति and गति and the

---

1. (i) Vide Thibaut George, The Vedānta Sūtras Part I, Introduction p. v-vi (ii) Ghate V.S., The Vedānta pp. 89-90 (iii) Sharma B.N.K., The Brahmasūtras and their principal commentaries, Vol. II, pp. 227-243 (iv) Belvalkar S.K., Vedānta Philosophy Part I, pp. 159-160.

third movement आगति is described from the B.U. It may be possible to trace all the movements from one and the same Upaniṣad. Here perhaps the B.U. can serve our purpose. तेन प्रद्योतेनैष आत्मा निष्क्रामति चक्षुषो वा मूर्ध्नो वाऽन्येभ्यो वा शरीरदेशेभ्य: तमुत्क्रमन्तं प्राणोऽनूत्क्रामति। (B.U, 4-4-2). By that light, the self departs either through the eye, or through the head or through other apertures of the body. And when he thus departs, life departs after him. This passage will be the v.v. for the movement of the उत्क्रान्ति. This passage, in fact, has been cited by Rāmānuja for utkrānti And for other two viz. गति and आगति. We have a passage after the one quoted above. तदेष श्लोको भवति।

तदेव सक्त: सह कर्मणेति लिङ्गं मनो यत्र निषक्तमस्य।
प्राप्यान्तं कर्मणस्तस्य यत्किंचेह करोत्ययम्।
तस्माल्लोकात्पुनरेत्यस्मै लोकाय कर्मणे॥ (B.U. 4-4-6)

On this there is the following verse :

Object to which the mind is attached, the subtle self gives together with the deed, being attached to it alone. Exhausting the results of whatever works he did in this world, he comes again from that world to this world for (fresh) work.

It may be mentioned that a part of the above quoted passage i.e. तस्माल्लोकात्... कर्मणे has indeed been cited by Śaṅkara to illustrate the movement of returning.

The second sūtra is स्वात्मना चोत्तरयो:। (2-3-20). And on account of the two latter (i.e. going and returning) being connected with its own self (i.e. the agent), the soul is of atomic size. As far as passing out is concerned, it may be said that the soul passes out when it ceases to be the ruler of the body, or gives up its claim to the body when the results of its former actions are exhausted even though it may not have left the body. But the going and returning are such activities which abide in the agent.

Some texts even mention the parts of the body from which the souls depart. चक्षुषो वा मूर्ध्नो वान्येभ्यो वा शरीरदेशेभ्य:। (B.U. 4-4-2) Either from the eye, or from the skull, or from other places of the body (the self passes out). This is possible if the soul is of a finite size i.e. atomic size.

The third sūtra is नाणुरतच्छ्रुतेरिति चेन्नेतराधिकारात्। (2-3-21) If it be said that the soul is not atomic on account of the scriptural

statements about what is not that, we deny that, on account of the other one (the Highest Self) being the subject matter of these passages. There are scriptural passages which state that the soul is all-pervading. स वा एष महानज आत्मा योऽयं विज्ञानमयः प्राणेषु। (B.U. 4-4-22) He is that great unborn self who consists of knowledge, is surrounded by the prāṇas.

आकाशवत्सर्वगतश्च नित्यः। सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म। (T.U. 2-1) Like the ether, He is omnipresent, eternal. Truth, knowledge, infinite is Brahman. This objection is removed by saying that these statements refer to the Highest Self, and not the individual soul.

The fourth sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is स्वशब्दोन्मानाभ्यां च। (2-3-22) And because of the direct statement and the measure, the soul is of atomic size. Scriptures directly mention the size of the soul. एषोऽणुरात्मा चेतसा वेदितव्यो यस्मिन्प्राणः पञ्चधा संविवेश। (M.U. 3-1-9) By thought is to be known that atomic self into which breath has entered fivefold. Another Upaniṣad also mentions the exact measurement of the soul : बालाग्रशतभागस्य शतधा कल्पितस्य च। भागो जीवः स विज्ञेयः। (S.U. 5-8) That living soul is to be known as part of the hundredth part of the point of a hair divided a hundred times.

The fifth sūtra is अविरोधश्चन्दनवत् (2-3-23) There is no contradiction as in the case of the sandalpaste. If the objection is raised that if the soul is assumed to be of atomic size, and so occupy only one point of the body, how can one feel any sensation over the whole body? The answer is provided in the sūtra by way of analogy. Though sandalpaste is applied only to a particular part of the body, it gives an agreeable sensation extending over the whole of the body. The atomic soul may occupy a part of the body, the sensation could be felt over the whole body.

It may be objected that we do not know that the soul occupies a particular place, the answer to this is that the soul also is assigned a particular place according to some texts हृदि ह्येष आत्मा। (P.U. 3-6) The self is in the heart. कतम आत्मेति योऽयं विज्ञानमयः प्राणेषु हृद्यन्तर्ज्योतिः पुरुषः। (B.U. 4-3-7). What is that self? He who is within the heart, surrounded by the prāṇas, the person is light, consisting of knowledge.

The next two sūtras viz. गुणाद्वा लोकवत्। (2-3-25) and व्यतिरेको गन्धवत्। (2-3-26) are the arguments of the worldly illustrations and hence there is no scope for the v.v. So we just skip over them.

The ninth sūtra is तथा च दर्शयति। (2-3-27) Thus also the scriptures declare. Scriptures declare that the atomic soul pervades the whole body on account of the quality of intellignece स एष प्राण एव प्रज्ञात्मेदं शरीरमात्मानमनुप्रविष्ट आलोमभ्य आनखेभ्यः। (Kau.U. 4-20).

This very life spirit, even the self of intelligence, has entered this bodily self to the very hairs and nails.

The tenth sūtra is पृथगुपदेशात्। (2-3-28). On account of the separate teaching about soul and intelligence. There are passages which declare the quality of intelligence and the self to be separate. प्रज्ञया शरीरं समारुह्य। (Kau. U. 3-6). Having by knowledge, taken possession of the body. B.U. also states तदेषां प्राणानां विज्ञानेन विज्ञानमादाय। (B.U. 2-1-17). Then the intelligent person, having through the intelligence of the senses, absorbed within himself all-intelligence. This shows intelligence to be different from the agent the embodied soul.

So the soul can be atomic and its attribute, intelligence can be said to extend beyond it.

The eleventh sūtra is तद्गुणसारत्वात्तु तद्व्यपदेशः। प्राज्ञवत्। (2-3-29). But that declaration as atomic is on account of its having for its essence the qualities of that (i.e. the buddhi) even as the Intelligent Self (which is all-pervading is said to be atomic). Atomicity essentially belongs to buddhi or understanding and is wrongly referred to the self which is Highest Brahman. As Brahman is all-pervading, the soul also is all-pervading. (B.U. 4-4-22) He is that great unborn self who consists of knowledge, is surrounded by the prāṇas. Intelligence constitutes the essential nature of the soul, even as heat and light constitute the nature of fire. Atomicity of the soul mentioned in the scriptures is metaphorical बालाग्रशतभागस्य शतधा कल्पितस्य च। भागो जीवः स विज्ञेयः स चानन्त्याय कल्पते।। (S.U. 5-9). That living soul is to be known as part of the hundredth part of the point of a hair, divided a hundred times and yet it is to be infinite. This passage mentions the soul to be atomic and then teaches it to be infinite. Now this can be possible only if we take the atomicity of the soul to be

metaphorical, while its infinity is real. Similarly बुद्धेर्गुणेनात्मगुणेन चैव आराग्रमात्रो ह्यवरोऽपि दृष्टः। (S.U. 6-8). The lower one, endowed with the quality of mind, and the quality of body, is seen small, even like the point of a goad, This passage teaches the soul's small size to depend on its connection with the qualities of the buddhi, not upon its own self. एषोऽणुरात्मा चेतसा वेदितव्यः। (M.U. 3-1-9). That small self is to be known by the mind. Here also aṇutva is to be taken either as referring to the difficulty of knowing the soul or else, to its limiting adjuncts. Thus the soul has for its essence the qualities of its limiting adjuncts, it is spoken of as minute. (The case is analogous to that of Brahman. (Prājña). Just as in these passages whose topic is the meditation on the qualified Brahman, the Highest Self is spoken of as possessing relative minuteness and so on, because it has two qualities of its limiting adjuncts for its essence. So it is also with the individual soul.

Or is Prājña to mean in ordinary usage the wise man? That is how S.K. Belvalkar opines.[1] The explanation provided by Belvalkar sounds plausible because, in the preceeding sūtras, the sūtrakāra has resorted to illustrations i.e. लोकवत् and गन्धवत् in the sūtras 25 and 26 respectively. Similarly, here also, the sūtrakāra may not be referring to Brahman by the word प्राज्ञ but may be citing an illustration from the mundane world.

The twelfth sūtra is यावदात्मभावित्वाच्च न दोषस्तद्दर्शनात्। (2-3-30). There is no defect, because (the connection of buddhi with the soul) exists so long as the soul (exists in saṁsāra), it being observed in scripture. From the view stated in the previous sūtra, it will follow that, when the conjunction of buddhi and soul-which are different entities ends, the soul also will vanish. This objection is not valid because the connection of the soul with the buddhi will last as long as the soul in the mundane state exists. As long as the transmigratory existence of the soul is not brought to end by means of the knowledge, the connection of the soul with the buddhi too will not cease. This is evident from the scriptures योऽयं विज्ञानमयः प्राणेषु हृद्यन्तर्ज्योतिः पुरुषः स समानः सन्नुभौ लोकावनुसंचरति ध्यायतीव लेलायतीव। (B.U. 4-3-7). He who is within the heart, consisting of knowledge, surrounded by the prāṇas, the person of light, he remaining the same wanders along the two worlds as if

1. Belvalkar S.K., Vedānta Philosophy, Part I, pp. 160-161

thinking as if moving. Here the term consisting of knowledge means consisting of buddhi as we infer from another passage i.e. विज्ञानमयो मनोमयः प्राणमयश्चक्षुमयः श्रोत्रमयः। (B.U. 4-4-5) The self is consisting of knowledge, mind, life, sight, hearing. Here knowledge is enumerated along with mind and therefore, knowledge has to be understood in the sense of buddhi.

The thirteenth sūtra is पुँस्त्वादिवत्त्वस्य सतोऽभिव्यक्तियोगात्। (2-3-31) As in the case of virility and so on, verily on account of the manifestation being possible only on its existing potentiality.

The fourteenth and the last sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is नित्योपलब्ध्यनुपलब्धप्रसङ्गोऽन्यतरनियमो वाऽन्यथा। (2-3-32).

Otherwise, (if no intellect existed) there would result either constant perception or constant non-perception or else a limitation of either the two (i.e. of the soul or of the senses).

These last two sūtras present some arguments based an either the worldly illustration or logic and hence do not have any v.v.

Kartrādhikaraṇam (2-3-33)

Kartrādhikaraṇa consists of the following sūtras :

(i) कर्ता शास्त्रार्थवत्त्वात्। (2-3-33)

(ii) विहारोपदेशात्। (2-3-34)

(iii) उपादानात्। (2-3-35)

(iv) व्यपदेशाच्च क्रियायां न चेन्निर्देशाविपर्ययः। (2-3-36)

(v) उपलब्धिवदनियमः। (2-3-37)

(vi) शक्तिविपर्ययात्। (2-3-3 8)

(vii) समाध्यभावाच्च। (2-3-39)

The first sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is कर्ता शास्त्रार्थवत्त्वात्। (2-3-33).

The soul is an agent because of scripture having a purport thereby. Scriptural injunctions like 'He is to sacrifice ''He is to give 'would be meaningful only if the soul were an agent. If the soul were not an agent, these injunctions would become purposeless. This sūtra is not, strictly speaking, meant to have any v.v., as it merely makes an assertion. However, Śruti does offer such statements which say that the soul is an agent. One śruti says एष हि द्रष्टा श्रोता मन्ता बोद्धा कर्ता विज्ञानात्मा पुरुषः। (P.U. 5-9) For it is he who sees, hears, perceives, conceives, acts, he the person whose self is knowledge.

The second sūtra is विहारोपदेशात् (2-3-34). And on account of the teaching of its moving about.

The śruti passages intended by the sūtra may be like the following:

अथ य इहात्मानमनुविद्य व्रजन्त्येतांश्च सत्यान्कामांस्तेषां सर्वेषु लोकेषु कामचारो भवति। (C.U. 8-1-6)

But those who depart hence, having found here, the self and those real desires for them in all worlds, there is freedom.

Saṅkara cites from the B.U. स ईयतेऽमृतो यत्र कामम्। (B.U. 4-3-12) स्वे शरीरे यथाकामं परिवर्तते। (B.U. 2-1-18).

That immortal one goes wherever he likes. He moves about in his own body as he pleases.

But the v.v. cited by us may perhaps be better suited to the context.

The third sūtra is उपादानात्। (2-3-35) On account of its taking up instruments. Senses are instruments of the soul. तदेषां प्राणानां विज्ञानेन विज्ञानमादाय। (B.U. 2-1-17)

Having taken through the intelligence of the senses, intelligence.

The fourth sūtra is व्यपदेशाच्च क्रियायां न चेन्निर्देशाविपर्ययः। (2-3-36) The soul is an agent because it is designated as such with regard to actions, if it were not so, there would be change of designation.

T.U. speaks विज्ञानं यज्ञं तनुते कर्माणि तनुतेऽपि च। (T.U. 2-5-1) Vijñāna performs the sacrifice and performs all acts. Here Vijñāna is a synonym for the soul. If Vijñāna were to mean 'buddhi' as in the B.U. quoted above in the previous sūtra, the word Vijñāna would have been used in the instrumental and not in the nominative which indicates that it is the independent doer other than buddhi. Hence it is the doer of actions.

The fifth sūtra i.e. उपलब्धिवदनियमः। (2-3-37) and the sixth sūtra i.e. शक्तिविपर्ययात्। (2-3-38) are also not meant to have any v.v.

The seventh sūtra is समाध्यभावाच्च। (2-3-39) And on account of the absence of meditation. If the self is not an agent then the meditation taught in the Vedānta texts would not be possible. Upaniṣads declare आत्मा वा अरे द्रष्टव्यः श्रोतव्यो मन्तव्यो निदिध्यासितव्यः। (B.U. 2-4-5). Verily, the self is to be seen, to be heard, to be reflected upon, to be meditated upon. (C.U. 8-7-1) The self we

must seek out we must try to understand. ओमित्येवं ध्यायथ आत्मानम्। (M.U. 2-2-6). Meditate on the self as Om. Therefore the self is an agent

Takṣādhikaraṇam (2-3-40).

The adhikaraṇa has only one sūtra i.e. यथा च तक्षोभयथा। (2-3-40). And as the carpenter in both ways. This sūtra purports to explain the कर्तृत्व of the soul with the help of an illustration from the mundane world, and hence, naturally, it would not have any v.v. However, Śaṅkara, explains the sūtra in the following manner. Śaṅkara, taking the sūtra as a separate adhikaraṇa, answers the question whether the Kartṛtva which has been said to be belonging to the soul in the preceeding sūtras belongs to it as its inherent attribute or is only attributed to it by super imposition, and he comes to the conclusion that it is superimposed. So v.v. in view of Śaṅkara would be आत्मेन्द्रियमतो युक्तं भोक्तेत्याहुर्मनीषिण:। (Kaṭha U. 5-4). The self when in union with the body, the senses, and the mind is called the enjoyer by wise people.

Parāyattādhikaraṇam (2-3-41, 42)

This adhikaraṇa has two sūtras viz. (i) परात्तु तच्छ्रुते:। (2-3-41)
(ii) कृतप्रयत्नापेक्षस्तु विहितप्रतिषिद्धवैयर्थ्यादिभ्य:।

The first sūtra is परात्तु तच्छ्रुते:। (2-3-41). But that agency of the soul is derived from the Supreme Lord, so the scripture teaches. एष ह्येव साधु कर्म कारयति तं यमेभ्यो लोकेभ्य उन्निनीषते। एष ह्येवासाधु कर्म कारयति तं यमधो निनीषते। (Kau. U. 3-8) He makes him whom he wishes to lead up from these worlds do a good deed, and the same makes him whom he wishes to lead down from these worlds, do a bad deed.

But if the causal agency thus belongs to the Lord, it follows that, he must be cruel and unjust and that the soul has to undergo consequences of what it has not done. This is the objection, which according to Śaṅkara, Nimbārka, and Vallabha the following sūtra meets. According to Rāmānuja, the objection that if the causal agency belongs to the lord, then the Śāstra of विधि and निषेध would be redundant is sought to be met in the following sūtra.

कृतप्रयत्नापेक्षस्तु विहितप्रतिषिद्धावैयर्थ्यादिभ्य:। (2-3-42)

But the Lord's making the soul act is dependent on the efforts made by the soul, only thus will the injunctions and prohibitions etc. be meaningful.

The sūtra is simply meeting an objection on the basis of Logic and hence, not meant to have any v.v.

Amśādhikaraṇam (2-3-43 to 53)

The adhikaraṇam cosists of the following 11 sūtras:

(i) अंशो नानाव्यपदेशादन्यथा चापि दाशकितवादित्वमधीयत एके। (2-3-43)

(ii) मंत्रवर्णाच्च। (2-3-44)

(iii) अपि च स्मर्यते। (2-3-45)

(iv) प्रकाशादिवन्नैवं परः। (2-3-46)

(v) स्मरन्ति च। (2-3-47)

(vi) अनुज्ञापरिहारौ देहसंबन्धाज्ज्योतिरादिवत्। (2-3-48)

(vii) असंततेश्चाव्यतिकरः। (2-3-49)

(viii) आभास एव च। (2-3-50)

(ix) अदृष्टानियमात्। (2-3-51)

(x) अभिसन्ध्यादिष्वपि चैवम्। (2-3-52)

(xi) प्रदेशादिति चेन्नान्तर्भावात्. (2-3-53)

In the previous section it was pointed out that the Lord controls the soul. Here the question raised is about the relation of the individual soul to Brahman. The first sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is अंशो नानाव्यपदेशादन्यथा चापि दाशकितवादित्वमधीयत एके। (2-3-43). The soul is a part of the lord, on account of the declarations of difference and (because) in a different way also, some record slaves, fishers and so on are of the nature of Brahman. Thus the sūtra makes out jīva to be a part of Brahman.

Lord is not identical with the soul because of declaration of difference in the śruti सोऽन्वेष्टव्यः स विजिज्ञासितव्यः। (C.U. 8-7-1) That which we must search out, that it is which we must try to understand. This passage shows that Brahman is different from jīva. This is the v.v. of Śaṅkara in addition to the passage from the Brahmasūtra referred to in the sūtra itself

ब्रह्म दाशा ब्रह्म दासा ब्रह्मैवेमे कितवा Brahman are the fisherman, Brahman the slaves; Brahman these gamblers.

In order to, point out that Brahman is not identical with jīva, Śaṅkara has quoted the above passage from the C.U. But the

passage does not make out that the jīva is a part of Brahman. It does not explicitely and unequivocally say so. Rāmānuja has referred to the passage ज्ञाज्ञौ द्वावजावीशनीशौ from S.U. which also states the separate identity of Brahman and jīva. However, it may be stated that, these commentators have failed to point out the exact v.v. from the Upaniṣads which categorically states jīva to be a part of Brahman.

Of course, Madhvācārya has pointed out the passage incorporating exactly the philosophy contained in the sūtra.

अंश एव हीमे जीवाश्चांशी परमेश्वर:. This is from गौपपवनश्रुति which is, as is often the case with Madhvācārya, not traceable.

But, perhaps, the Sūtrakāra too has not got any particular passage of the Upaniṣad in mind as can be gathered from the reading of the sūtra अंशो नानाव्यपदेशात्। jīva is a part on account of the declarations of the difference, And it is also worthnoting that there is not a single śruti passage which states the jīva to be an अंश of ब्रह्मन्. This is rather curious. Is Sūtrakāra enunciating his own philosophy?

The second sūtra is मन्त्रवर्णाच्च। (2-3-44) And on account of the mantra. A mantra also intimates the same view, एतावानस्य महिमा ततो ज्यायांश्च पुरुष:। पादोऽस्य सर्वा भूतानि त्रिपादस्यामृतं दिवि। (Rg. 10-90-3) Such is the greatness of it, greater than it is the person. One foot of it are all beings, three feet of it are the immortal in heaven. Rāmānuja says अंशवाची हि पादशब्द:।

So in this sūtra one more reason from the śruti i.e. from the Ṛgveda, has been adduced. (2-3-45)

The third sūtra is अपि च स्मर्यते। Moreover, it is so stated in the smṛti. Bhagvadgītā states ममैवांशो जीवलोके जीवभूत: सनातन:। (B.G. 15/7) An eternal part of me becomes the individual soul in the world of life.

The fourth sūtra प्रकाशादिवन्नैवं पर:। (2-3-46) As the soul is affected by pleasure and pain, not so the highest lord, as in the case of light and so on. This sūtra makes a point by an illustration of light and hence, does not have a v.v.

The fifth sūtra is स्मरन्ति च। (2-3-47) And the smṛtis state The statements of the smṛtis are brought in order to corroborate the fact that Absolute remains unaffected. तत्र य: परमात्मा हि स नित्यो निर्गुण: स्मृत:। न लिप्यते फलैश्चापि पद्मपत्रमिवाम्भसा।। (M.B. XII). There that

supreme is said to be eternal and attributeless. Like the lotus leaf by water, it is not tainted by fruits. न मां कर्माणि लिम्पन्ति न मे कर्मफले स्पृहा। (B.G. 4-14) Actions do not taint me nor I have any longing for the fruits of action.

The indeclinable च is interpreted to be referring to the śruti passages. तयोरन्य: पिप्पलं स्वाद्वत्त्यनश्नन्नन्योऽभिचाकशीति। (S.U. 4-6) One of those two enjoys the sweet pippal fruit and the other one simply looks on एकस्तथा सर्वभूतान्तरात्मा न लिप्यते लोकदु:खेन बाह्य:। (Kaṭha U. 2-5-11) The one self within all beings is never contaminated by the miserly of the world, being himself without.

We skip the remaining sūtras of the adhikaraṇa, as they do not have any v.v. in view.

Here ends the third pāda of the second adhyāya.

2-4

Geneisis of the material elements and the essential characteristics of the individual soul were discussed in the third pāda. Now the sūtrakāra proceeds to consider the passage referring to prāṇas. This pāda removes an apparent conflict in the śrutis with reference to the senses, the mind, mukhya prāṇa, and the physical body. The conflicts relate to questions of their genesis, number, status etc. Thus it will be seen that this fourth pāda is a sort of an extension of the third pāda, and more oftern than not does have nothing or very little to do with the v.v.

Prāṇotpattyadhikaraṇam (2-4-1 to 4)

The first adhikaraṇa of the pāda has the following four sūtras:

(i) तथा प्राणा:। (2-4-1)

(ii) गौण्यसंभवात्। (2-4-2)

(iii) तत्प्राक्श्रुतेश्च। (2-4-3)

(iv) तत्पूर्वकत्वाद्वाच:। (2-4-4)

This adhikaraṇa states that praṇas are created from Brahman, just like the elements referred to in the preceeding pāda. This is the view of all the commentators except Vallabha who holds that prāṇas are unborn as the individual souls, which as V.S. Ghate writes '........... is very interesting indeed to see, two absolutely different conclusions arrived at from the same sūtras.' [1]

1. Ghate V.S., The Vedānta, p. 101

Apart from this conflicting interpretations, the adhikaraṇa in itself tries to resolve the apparent contradictions among the śrutis, C.U. (6-2-3, 4) makes no mention of the prāṇas. Similarly in the T.U. (2-1-1) also prāṇas do not find any mention. But there are passages which mention that vital breaths are created. B.U. (2-1-20) states यथाऽग्नेर्ज्वलत: क्षुद्रा विस्फुल्लिङ्गा व्युच्चरन्त्येवमेवैतस्मादात्मन: सर्वे प्राणा:। As small sparks come forth from fire, thus do all prāṇas come forth from that self. M.U. also says एतस्माज्जायते प्राणो मन: सर्वेन्द्रियाणि च। (M.U. 2-1-3) From that is born the vital air, mind and all organs of sense सप्त प्राणा: प्रभवन्ति तस्मात्। (M.U. 2-1-8) The seven vital airs spring from him.

स प्राणमसृजत्। (P.u. 6-4) He sent forth the vital air.

The second sūtra is गौण्यसंभवात्। (2-4-2) On account of the impossibility of explaining the origination in a secondary sense. The sūtra, it is apparent, deals with the interpretation of the śruti passages particulary एतस्माज्जायते प्राण:। (M.U. 2-1-5) mentioned in the previous sūtra.

The third sūtra is तत्प्राक्श्रुतेश्च। (2-4-3) And on account of that word which indicates origin, being mentioned first, in connection with the prāṇas. The sūtra refers to the passage from the M.U. in which in the beginning comes the word 'born' एतस्माज्जायते प्राण:। (M.U. 2-1-3) From Him are born vital breaths. The word 'born' occurs at the very beginning. If it is repeated in the primary sense, with respect to ether etc., it should be so interpreted with regard to vital breath, mind and organs mentioned earlier.

The fourth sūtra is तत्पूर्वकत्वाद्वाच: (2-4-4) Because speech is preceeded by that (viz. fire and other elements) तत्तेजोऽसृजत। (C.U. 6-2-3) That sent forth fire.

This passage shows that the organs are the products of the elements which in their turn, arise from Brahman. So they are also products of Brahman.

Saptagatyadhikaraṇam (2-4-5, 6)

The adhikaraṇa consists of the two sūtras viz.

(i) सप्त गतेर्विशेषितत्वाच्च। (2-4-5) and

(ii) हस्तादयस्तु स्थितेऽतो नैवम्। (2-4-6)

The adhikaraṇa attempts at resolving the conflict of testimony regarding the member of senses of the śrutis.

The first sūtra is सप्तगतेर्विशेषितत्वाच्च। (2-4-5) The organs are seven in number because it is known from scriptures and of the specification fo those seven. This sūtra presents a primafacie view. There are texts which declare that there are seven organs सप्त प्राणा: प्रभवन्ति तस्मात्। (M.U. 2-1-8) The seven prāṇas spring from him and there is a specification in the text. सप्त वै शीर्षण्या: प्राणा:। (Taittirīya Saṁhitā 5-1-7-1) Seven indeed are the prāṇas of the head. So the pūrvapakṣa concludes that the organs are seven in number as specified in the śrutis.

The second sūtra is हस्तादयस्तु स्थितेऽतो नैवम्। (2-4-6) But the hands etc. are also mentioned as senseorgans in scriptural texts. This being so, it is not like this (they are not merely seven in number) 'Tu' refutes the view of the previous sūtra. The number is said to be eleven consisting of the five organs of knowledge, the five organs of actions, and the inner organ. Manas or, mind, buddhi or understanding, ahaṁkāra and citta are all different states of the internal organ as B.U. puts it एतत्सर्वं मन एव। (B.U. 1-5-3) All this is mind only. They are not separate organs and do not raise the number beyond eleven. The number eleven is confirmed in the scriptural text दशेमे पुरुषे प्राणा: आत्मैकादश:। (B.U. 3-9-4) These are ten vital breaths in man and ātman (manas) as the eleventh. Prāṇāṇutvādhikaraṇam (2-4-7)

This adhikaraṇa resolves the conflict of testimony regarding the size of the sense-organs after the question of their number has been settled. The adhikaraṇa is of only one sūtra अण्वश्च (2-4-7) And they are minute. The sense organs are of munute size.

Prāṇaśraiṣthyādhikaraṇam (2-4-8)

This adhikaraṇa too is only of one sūtra i.e. (2-4-8) And the best (the chief vital breath). The v.v. would be प्राणो वाव ज्येष्ठश्च श्रेष्ठश्च। (C.U.5-1-1)

The vital breath is indeed the oldest and the best. **Navāyukriyādhikaraṇam** (2-4-9 to 12)

The adhikaraṇa has the following four sūtras viz.

(i) न वायुक्रिये पृथुगुपदेशात्। (2-4-9)

(ii) चक्षुरादिवत्तु तत्सहशिष्ट्यादिभ्य:। (2-4-10)

(iii) अकरणत्वाच्च न दोषस्तथा हि दर्शयति। (2-4-1)

(iv) पञ्चवृत्तिर्मनोवद्व्य पञ्चदिश्यते। (2-4-12)

The adhikaraṇa deals with the nature and character of the chief vital air. Madhva regards sūtras 8 and 9 as forming one adhikaraṇa by themselves, and sūtras 10 and 11 as forming another adhikaraṇa. Sūtra 12 constitutes an independent adhikaraṇa. V.S. Ghate observes, 'One cannot help remarking here that the division into adhikaraṇas followed by all the commentators except Madhva is rather arbitrary. Either all these sūtras from 8 to 13 all alike referring to the chief vital air should form one adhikaraṇa or we should have four adhikaraṇas predicating four characteristics of the chief vital air.

That, as a matter of fact, is the division adopted in Madhva's commentary.'[1]

The first sūtra is न वायुक्रिये पृथगुपदेशात्। (2-4-9) The chief vital breath is neither air nor function (of the organs) on account of its being mentioned separately.

The objection is raised that there is no separate principle called prāṇa or vital breath. It is just air which exists in the mouth as well as outside. The sūtra points out that prāṇa is neither air nor a function, as many scriptural texts distinguish prāṇa from air and function एतस्माज्जायते प्राणो मनः सर्वेन्द्रियाणि च। खं वायुः। (M.U. 2-1-3) From this is born breath, mind and all organs of sense, ether, air. This shows that prāṇa is mentioned separately both from air and senseorgans. Nor can we say that prāṇa is the name of the common function of all the organs taken together, for whereas we do find that each of the organs has got an exclusive function of its own, it is nowhere seen that all of them have got any additional function to perform jointly. So prāṇa is different from all, functions and air.

If this be so, another objection could be raised then. Prāṇa also must be considered to be independent in the body like the individual soul as scripture declares to be the best and the organs such as speech etc. to be subordinate to it. And various powers are ascribed to it in scriptural passages. It is said for instance that, when speech and the other organs are asleep, the prāṇa alone is awake, that the prāṇa is the absorber, it absorbs speech etc. that the prāṇa guards the other senses as a mother her sons. सुप्तेषु

---

1. Ghate V.S., The Vedānta, p. 103

वागादिषु प्राण एवैको हि जागर्ति। (Kaṭha U. 2-5-8) Prāṇa alone is awake when organs like speech etc. are asleep. प्राण एको मृत्युनाऽनाप्तः। (B.U. 1-5-21) Prāṇa alone is not overcome by death. प्राणः संवर्गो वागादीन्संवृक्ते। (B.U. 3-3) Prāṇa is the absorber, it absorbs speech. प्राण इतरान्प्राणान् रक्षति मातेव पुत्रान्। (B.U. 2-13). Prāṇa guards the other senses as a mother her sons. Hence it follows that prāṇa is independent as the individual soul.

This view is refuted in the next sūtra तत्सह शिष्टादिभ्यः। (2-4-10). But the lifebreath is subordinate to the soul like the eye etc. on account of its being taught with them and other reasons.

In the upaniṣads like the C.U., the vital breath is mentioned along with sense-organs. They are grouped together, since they are subordinate to the soul.

अथ ह वाचमुद्गीथमुपासांचक्रिरे... अथ ह चक्षुरुद्गीथम्...श्रोत्रम्... मन उद्गीथमुपासांचक्रिरे... अथ ह एवायं मुख्यः प्राणस्तमुद्गीथमुपासां चक्रिरे। (C.U. 1-2-3 to 7) Then they meditated on the Udgīṭha as speech.... Then they meditated on the Udgīṭha as the eye... the ear... they meditated on the udgīṭha as the mind... Then they meditated on udgīṭha as the breath in the mouth.

If the prāṇa is an instrument like the eye and so on, then, we must assume another senseobject for it is analogous to colour and so on. The third sūtra of the adhikaraṇa rebuts this argument. The sūtra is

अकरणत्वाच्च न दोषस्तथा हि दर्शयति। (2-4-11) And on account of its not being an instrument, the objection is not valid. For thus the scripture shows.

Prāṇa is not an instrument or organ like the eye, for which a separate sense object is necessary, yet it has a function in the body via. the maintenance of the body. Prāṇasaṁvāda may be the passage for discussion.

अथ ह प्राणा अहंश्रेयसि व्यूदिरे... यस्मिन्व उत्क्रान्ते शरीरं पापिष्ठतरमिव दृश्यते स वः श्रेष्ठः। (C.U. 5-1-6, 7) The prāṇas quarrelled together as to who was the best. He by whose departure, the body seems worse than the worst, he is the best of you. Each started leaving one by one and ultimately when the chief prāṇa was about to depart, all other prāṇas became loosened and the body was about to perish. This shows that the body and all the senses subsist by means of

chief prāṇa. So the vital breath serves the purpose of the individual soul.

The fourth sūtra is पञ्चवृत्तिर्मनोवत् व्यपदिश्यते। (2-4-12) It is taught as having a fivefold function like the mind. It has five functions viz. prāṇa, apāna, vyāna, udāna, samāna, breathing in, breathing out, holding in so as to assist works requiring strength, the ascending when the soul passes out of the body, and the function which carries the nutriment through all the limbs of the body. The passage is from the B.U. कामस्सङ्कल्पो, विचिकित्सा, श्रद्धाऽश्रद्धा-धृतिरधृतिर्ह्रीर्धीर्भीरित्येतत्सर्वं मन एव। प्राणोऽपानो व्यान उदानस्समान इत्येत्सर्वं प्राण एव। (B.U. 1-5-2,3)

Desire, determination, doubt, faith, lack of faith, steadfastness, lack of steadfastness, shame, intellection, fear, all this is truly mind,... the in-breath, the outbreath, the diffused breath, the upbreath, the middlebreath, all that is breath only.

Thus in this adhikaraṇa, the nature and character of the chief vital air is dealt with **śreṣṭhāṇutvādhikaraṇam** (2-4-13) The adhikaraṇa consists of only one sūtra i.e. (2-4-13) And it is minute. It is minute, limited and subtle, like the śruti, it is referred to as all-pervading समः प्लुषिणा समो मशकेन समो नागेन सम एभिस्त्रिभिर्लोकैः समोऽनेन सर्वेण। (B.U. 1-3-22). He is equal to a grub, equal to a gnat, equal to an elephant, equal to these three worlds, equal to this universe. It is three worlds, equal to this universe.

It is replied that here the reference is to Hiraṇyagarbha, the cosmic soul. Prāṇa is of minute size because otherwise तमुत्क्रामन्तं प्राणोऽनूत्क्रामति। (B.U. 6-4-2) Him, parting, prāṇa follows, this statement of the śruti would not have been possible.

Jyotirādyadhikaraṇam (2-4-14 to 16)

This adhikaraṇa consists of the following three sūtras viz.

(i) ज्योतिराद्यधिष्ठानं तु तदामननात्। (2-4-14)।

(ii) प्राणवता शब्दात्। (2-4-15)

(iii) तस्य च नित्यत्वात्। (2-4-16)

The first sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is ज्योतिराद्यधिष्ठानं तु तदामननात्। (2-4-14) But the guidance by fire etc. on account of the declaration of that. The question is raised about the dependence or independence of the vital breath and the other organs. They are said to be controlled by gods like fire etc. अग्निर्वाग्भूत्वा मुखं प्राविशत्।

Aitareya Āraṇyaka U. (2-4) Agni having become speech entered the mouth. Thus the organs are dependent on presiding deities. C.U. states वागेव ब्रह्मणश्चतुर्थः पादः सोऽग्निना ज्योतिषा भाति तपति च। (C.U. 3-18-33). Speech is indeed the fourth foot of Brahman, that foot shines with Agni as its light and warms. This deserves to be the v.v. of the sūtra.

Rāmānuja cites the passage from the B.U.

योऽग्नौ तिष्ठन्नग्नेरन्तरो यमग्निर्न वेद यस्याग्निशरीरम्।

योऽग्निमन्तरो यमयति स त आत्माऽन्तर्याम्यमृतः।। (B.U. 3-7-6)

He who dwells in the fire, yet it is within the fire, whom the fire does not know, whose body the fire is, who controls the fire, from within, he is your self; the inner controller, the immortal.

Rāmānuja states that senseorgans together with their guiding divinities and the individual soul depend in all their doings on the will of the Highest person. To V.S. Ghate, this interpretation seems 'rather farfetched.'[1]

The second sūtra is प्राणवता शब्दात् (2-4-15)

Because the prāṇas are connected with the possessor of the prāṇas (i.e. the latter cannot cease to be the bhoktā, we learn this) from śruti.

Notwithstanding the divinities which guide the prāṇas, the individual soul with which the prāṇas are connected remains the bhoktā, he is the possessor of the instruments of actions. The scriptures declare that the relation between the soul and the organs is that of master and servant. The scripture states

अथ यत्रैतदाकाशमनुविषण्णं चक्षुः स चाक्षुषः पुरुषो दर्शनाय चक्षुरथ यो वेदेदं जिघ्राणीति स आत्मा गन्धाय घ्राणम्। (C.U. 8-2-14) Where the sight has entered into the void, there is the person of the eye, the eye itself is the instrument of seeing. He who knows, let me smell this, he is the self, the nose is the instrument of smelling.

The third sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is तस्य च नित्यत्वात्। (2-4-16) And on account of the permanence of that (i.e. the embodied soul). The soul resides permanently in the body as the experiencer of pleasure and pain and the results of good and evil actions.

1. Ghate V.S., The Vedānta, p. 104

Indriyādhikaraṇam (2-4-17 to 19)

The adhikaraṇa is comprised of three sūtras viz.

(i) इन्द्रियाणि तद्व्यपदेशादन्यत्र श्रेष्ठात्। (2-4-17)

(ii) भेदश्रुतेः। (2-4-18)

(iii) वैलक्षण्याच्च। (2-4-18)

Now a doubt arises as to whether the other prāṇas are functions of the mukhya prāṇa or different entities (tattvāntarāṇi-Śaṅkara) The pūrvapakṣa maintains that they are mere functions on account of scriptural statement.

सर्वे हन्तास्यैव सर्वे रूपतामेति त एतस्यैव सर्वे रूपमभवन्। (B.U. 1-5-21) Well, let us all assume his form, thereupon they all assumed his form. The sūtra says that they are independent since they are separately mentioned in the scripture. एतस्माज्जायते प्राणो मनः सर्वेन्द्रियाणि च। (M.U. 2-1-5). From him is born breath, mind and all organs of sense. The lifebreath is not treated as a senseorgan. This difference of designation is appropriate only if there is a difference of being. If there were unity of being, it would be contradictory that the life-principle should sometimes be designated as a sense-organ and sometimes not. So the other lifebreaths are different entities from the chief vital breath.

The second sūtra is भेदश्रुतेः। (2-4-18). On account of the scriptural texts regarding difference. In the B.U. the organs are treated in one section ते ह वाचमुचुः। (B.U. 1-3-2). They indeed spoke to speech. In another section the vital breath is treated. अथ हेममासन्यं प्राणमुचुः। (B.U. 1-5-3) Then they spoke to the breath into the mouth.

The third sūtra is वैलक्षण्याच्च। (2-4-19) And, on account of characteristic differences. Vital breath is different from the organs.

The Kalpataru suggests that the last two sūtras should form a separate adhikaraṇa (द्वे इमे अधिकरणे इत्यर्थः)।

Saṃjñāmūrtiklṛptyadhikaraṇam (2-4-20 to 22). This is the last adhikaraṇa of the last pāda of the second adhyāya. It has three sūtras viz.

(i) संज्ञामूर्तिक्लृप्तिस्तु त्रिवृत्कुर्वत उपदेशात्। (2-4-20)

(ii) मांसादिभौमं यथाशब्दमितरयोश्च। (2-4-21)

(iii) वैशेष्यात्तु तद्वादः तद्वादः. (2-4-22)

The first sūtra is संज्ञामूर्तिक्लृप्तिस्तु त्रिवृत्कुर्वतोपदेशात्। (2-4-20) But the fashioning of name and shape is the function of him who renders tripartite on account of the teaching. The question is raised whether the individual soul or the supreme Lord fashions names and shapes after the three elements have been created by the Lord. The scripture refers to the creation of elements.

That divinity thought : Let me now enter those three divinities with this living self and let me then develop names and forms, let me make each of these three tripartite.

So the doubt arises whether the shaping of the gross world after the elements have been created is done by the individual soul or the Supreme Lord. The sūtra says that individual soul has not the power to make the gross world.

The second sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is मांसादि भौमं यथाशब्दमितरयोश्च। (2-4-21) Flesh and the rest are of earthly nature in accordance with the scriptural text and of the other two via. water and fire.

Food in earth when assimilated by man becomes flesh, as the scripture states अन्नमशितं त्रेधा विधीयते तस्य सः स्थविष्ठो धातुस्तत्पुरीषं भवति, यो मध्यमस्तन्मांसं योऽणिष्ठस्तन्मनः। (C.U. 6-5-1) Food when eaten becomes threefold, its grossest portion becomes faeces, its middle portion flesh, its subtlest portion mind.

But if all the gross elements contain the three fine elements, why do we have special names for earth, water, and fire? The answer is provided in the next and the last sūtra of the adhyāya.

वैशेष्यात्तु तद्वादस्तद्वादः। (2-4-22) But on account of distinctiveness, there is that designation, that designation. As the five elements are not found in equal proportion in each of the gross elements, they are named after that element which is found in a preponderant degree in their composition.

The word तद्वादः is repeated to indicate the conclusion of the adhyāya.

CHAPTER - 7

THE VIṢAYAVĀKYAS IN THE FIRST AND SECOND PĀDAS OF THE SĀDHANĀDHYĀYA

Herewith starts the third adhyāya which is traditionally designated as Sādhanādhyāya. It considers the means of attaining mokṣa. The first adhyāya deals with the nature of Brahman, the second clears the objections, refutes rival theories regarding the Ultimate Reality and now this adhyāya takes up the question of the means of realizing Brahman.

In the first pāda of the third adhyāya consideration of vairāgya is as one of the means of attaining Brahman. However as vairāgya is an attitude of the mind, it cannot be imposed from without by way of a command to be executed. It can be awakened in the heart of the seeker by creating a congenial climate. This is sought to be done in the opening pāda by focussing attention on the state of jīva after death, its limitations and miseries of transmigatory life. Dr. Radhakrishnan thus summarizes 'The first pāda of this chapter explains the significance of the different texts, removes doubts and attempts to produce a sense of dispassion for the world by disclosing its imperfections.' [1]

Tad antarapratipattyadhikaraṇam (3-1-1 to 7)

The first adhikaraṇa, according to Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja and other commentators, consists of seven sūtras, whereas, according to Madhva, seven sūtras form seven adhikaraṇas.

The seven sūtras are as follows :

(i) तदन्तरप्रतिपत्तौ रंहति संपरिष्वक्तः प्रश्ननिरूपणाभ्याम्। (3-1-1)

(ii) त्र्यात्मकत्वात्तु भूयस्त्वात्। (3-1-2)

(iii) प्राणगतेश्च। (3-1-3)

(iv) अग्न्यादिगतिश्रुतेरिति चेन्न भाक्तत्वात्। (3-1-4)

(v) प्रथमे श्रवणादिति चेन्न ता एव ह्युपपत्तेः। (3-1-5)

(vi) अश्रुतत्वादिति चेन्नेष्टादिकारिणां प्रतीतेः। (3-1-6)

(vii) भाक्तं वा नात्मवित्त्वात्तथा हि दर्शयति। (3-1-7)

---

1. Radhakrishnan, Brahmasūtra p. 432

The first sūtra is तदन्तरप्रतिपत्तौ रंहति संपरिष्वक्तः प्रश्ननिरूपणाभ्याम्। (3-1-) (3-1-) In obtaining a different body the soul goes enveloped by subtle parts of the elements, as appears from question and explanation.

The soul on departing from the body carries with it the sutble material elements, A passage from the C.U. is taken up for consideration. The question (praṣna) here is

वेत्थ यथा पञ्चम्यामाहुतावापः पुरुषवचसो भवन्ति। (C.U. 5-3-3)

Do you know why in the fifth oblation water is called man? The answer is water is called person, as the soul departs enveloped by water. The explanation is given in the entire passage. Five oblations in the form śraddhā, soma, rain, food and semen are offered in five fires viz. the heavenly world, Parjanya, the earth, man and woman. It is concluded

इति तु पञ्चम्यामाहुतावापः पुरुषवचसो भवन्ति। (5-9-1)

For this reason, water in the fifth oblation is called man. Thus the soul goes enveloped by water.

Vijñānabhikṣu takes up a different passage, one from the P.U. as meant here for consideration, He considers the fourth question from the P.U. अथ हैनं सौर्यायणी गार्ग्यः प्रपच्छ। भगवन्नेतस्मिन्पुरुषे कानि स्वपन्ति। कान्यस्मिन्जाग्रति। कतर एष देवः स्वप्नान्पश्यति। कस्यैतत्सुखं भवति। कस्मिन्नु सर्वे संप्रतिष्ठा भवन्तीति। तस्मै स होवाच। यथा गार्ग्य मरीचयोऽर्कस्यास्तं गच्छतः सर्वां एवस्मिंस्तैजोमण्डल एकीभवन्ति। ताः पुनः पुनरुदयतः प्रचरन्ति। एवं ह वै तत्सर्वं परे देवे मनस्येकीभवति। तेन तर्ह्येष पुरुषो न श‍ृणोति। न पश्यति। न जिघ्रति।

न रस्यते। न स्पृशते। नाभिवदते। नाऽदत्ते। नानदयते। न विसृजते। नेयायते। स्वपितीत्यचक्षते।...एष हि द्रष्टा, स्प्रष्टा, श्रोता, घ्राता, रसयिता, मन्ता, बोद्धा, कर्ता, विज्ञानात्मा पुरुषः। स परेऽक्षर आत्मनि संप्रतिष्ठते। (P.U. 4-4)

Then Gārgya, the grandson of Sūrya, asked him 'venerable Sir, what are they that sleep in this person? What are they that keep awake in him? What is the deity that sees the dreams? Whose is the happiness? In whom, pray, are all these established?' To him then he said, 'O Gārgya, as all the rays of the setting sun become one in this circle of light and as they spread forth when he rises again and again, even so, does all this become one in the Supreme God, the mind. Therefore, in that state, the person hears not, sees not, smells not, tastes not, touches not, speaks not, takes not, rejoices not, emits not, moves not,

Then they say, he sleeps.... He verily is the seer, the doer the thinking self, the person. He becomes established in the supreme Undecaying self.[1]

Obiviously this cannot be the v.v. of the adhikaraṇa as the topic of the adhikaraṇa is not sleep, but the actual state of the soul on his departure as can be seen from the context of the adhikaraṇa. If we regard vairāgya or dispassion as the motive of the pāda, then also, the passage chosen by Vijñānabhikṣu, in no way, induces vairāgya. The passage supplied by Vijñānabhikṣu does not suit the trend of the pāda.

Further, even Vijñānabhikṣu is not consistent in this matter. He does not pursue his line of thinking differing from other commentators. On the contrary, in the very next sūtra, he falls in line with the other commentators, taking up the conclusion of the same passage from the C.U. quoted by the commentators like Śaṅkara and others.

But an objection can be raised in respect of the quoted passage. From the question and answer, it follows that the soul goes enveloped by water only. How then can the general statement be made that the soul goes enveloped by the subtle parts of all elements? This objection is sought to be removed in the next sūtra त्र्यात्मकत्वात्तु भूयस्त्वात्। (3-1-2) But on account of water consisting of three elements, the soul goes enveloped by all these elements and not merely by water, though water alone is mentioned on account of its preponderance. In water are found the other two elements fire and earth. Water is specifically mentioned on account of its preponderance and not because it is the only element. Rāmānuja rightly quotes the C.U. to indicate the tripartite character of all the elements तासां त्रिवृत्तं त्रिवृतमेकैकाम्। (C.U. 6-3-3) Of those each one, tripartite, tripartite, to which Śaṅkara refers by saying त्र्यात्मिका ह्यापः, त्रिवृत्करणश्रुतेः। This (C.U. 6-3-3) is undoubtedly the v.v. of the sūtra.

The third sūtra is प्राणगतेश्च (3-1-3) But on account of the going of the vital breaths. The scripture states that when a new body is obtained the prāṇas also go from the old body to the new one.

1. Brahmasūtrabhāṣyam by Vijñānabhikṣu

तमुत्क्रामन्तं प्राणोऽनूत्क्रामति प्राणमनूत्क्रामन्तं सर्वे प्राणा अनूत्क्रामन्ति। (B.U. 4-4-2).

When he departs, the vital air departs after him, and when the prāṇa thus departs, all other organs depart after it. When they leave, they must have some base to go. So it is surmised that, the water and the other elements follow the soul and these form the basis for the organs.

The fourth sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is अग्न्यादिगतिश्रुतेरिति चेन्न भाक्तत्वात्। (3-1-4) If it be said that the lifebreaths and organs do not accompany the soul on account of the scriptural statements, as to entering into fire etc., we say that it is not so on account of metaphotical nature of those statements. A scriptural statement is kept in view here

यत्रास्य पुरुषस्य मृतस्याग्निं वागप्येति वातं प्राणाः। (B.U. 3-2-13)

When the speech of the dead person enter into fire, breath into air etc. If this be the case, how are the organs to accompany the soul? the sūtra replies that this is metaphorical.

The fifth sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is प्रथमे श्रवणादिति चेन्न ता एव ह्युपपत्तेः। If it be said on account of non-mention of water in the first fire, we reply, they alone, on account of propriety. It may be objected that in the previously quoted passage of the C.U. 5-4-2, Śraddhā is mentioned and not water. तस्मिन्नेतस्मिन्नग्नौ देवाः श्रद्धां जुह्वति। (C.U. 5-4-2) On that alter, the deities offer śraddhā, Here nothing is said about water. The answer to this objection is that, here śraddhā signifies water. Looking to the context also, śraddhā can signify water alone. The question is about water. How water in the fifth oblation can be called man? So the text would not refer to anything which is not water. So śraddhā must necessarily mean water. Moreover, the Taittirīya Saṁhitā states श्रद्धा वा आपः। (Tait. Sam. 1-6-8-1) Śraddhā, indeed is water.

The sixth sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is अश्रुतत्वादिति चेन्नेष्टादिकरिणां प्रतीतेः। (3-1-6) If it be said on account of non-mention of water, we say not so, because, it is understood from the scriptures that the souls who perform sacrifices etc. alone go to heaven. Now a further doubt is raised. In the abovequoted passage from the C.U., there is a mention of water only, but no reference to the soul. How can then one say that the soul departs enveloped by water and is born again as man? The passage from the C.U. states अथ य

इमे ग्राम इष्टापूर्ते दत्तमित्युपासते ते धूममभिसंभवन्ति। (C.U. 5-10-6) But they who living in a village practise sacrifices, works of public utility and alms, they go on the path of smoke. Now these same people are meant in the passage about the five fires also, as we conclude from the equality of scriptural statement in the passage तस्मिन्नेतस्मिन्नग्नौ देवा: श्रद्धां जुह्वति तस्या आहुते: सोमो राजा संभवति। (C.U. 5-4-2)

In that fire the deities offer Śraddhā, From that oblation rises the king Soma.

The passage from the C.U. further states एष सोमो राजा तद्देवानामन्नं तं भक्षयन्ति। (C.U. 5-10-4) That is the king Soma, that is the food of the gods; the gods do eat it.

ते चन्द्रं प्राप्यान्नं भवन्ति तांस्तत्र देवा यथा सोमं राजानमाप्यायत्वापक्षीयस्वेत्येवमेनांस्तत्र भक्षयन्ति। (B.U. 6-2-16) Having reached the moon, they become food and the deities feed on them, as one consumes the Soma with the words, 'O (Soma) swell forth, and disappear.' Now if according to these passages they are eaten by gods as by tigers, it is not possible that they should enjoy the fruit of their deeds, The following last sūtra of the adhikaraṇa replies to this objection. The sūtra is भाक्तं वा नात्मवित्त्वात्तथा हि दर्शयति. (3-1-7) or the statement of the souls being the food of the gods is metaphorical on account of their not knowing the self, for- thus scripture shows. The sūtra states that such statements are not to be taken literally. To say that the gods eat means they rejoice the performers of sacrifices, So this is the metaphorical sense. As the performers of the sacrifices do not know the self, their enjoyability by the gods is proper and metaphorical.

Kṛtātyayādhikaraṇam (3-1-8 to 11)

The adhikaraṇa, according to Śaṅkara and other commentators, except Madhva, consists of the following four sūtras viz.

(i) कृतात्ययेऽनुशयवान्दृष्टस्मृतिभ्यां यथेतमनेवं च। (3-1-8)

(ii) चरणादिति चेन्नोपलक्षणार्थेति कार्ष्णाजिनि:। (3-1-9)

(iii) आनर्थ्यकमिति चेन्न तदपेक्षत्वात्। (3-1-10)

(iv) सुकृतदुष्कृते एवेति तु बादरि:। (3-1-11)

Madhva has a slightly different arrangement. He splits the eighth sūtra and takes यथेतमनेवं च। as an independent sūtra and allots adhikaraṇas to individual sūtras separately.

The first sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is कृतात्ययेऽनुशयवान् दृष्टस्मृतिभ्यां यथेतमनेवं च। (3-1-8) According to śruti and smṛti, when the karmans are exhausted, the soul descends in the same manner in which is ascended and (exactly) not so. The passage under consideration is from the C.U.

तस्मिन्यावत्संपातमुषित्वाथैतमेवाध्वानं पुनर्निवर्तनो यथेतम्।... रमणीयचरणा ब्राह्मणादियोनिमापद्यन्ते कपूयचरणाः श्वादियोनिम्। (C.U. 5-10-5-7) Having stayed there as long as there is residue they return again that way as they come.

Those whose conduct has been good obtain some good birth, the birth of a Brahman etc. Those whose conduct has been evil obtain the birth of a dog etc. This passage suggests that all the karman is exhausted and there is no residual karman. Besides it is reasobable to think that karman earned in one life as man is exhausted in the next life in the world of the moon. The sūtra rejects the suggestion and points out that only that karman which gave the soul birth in heaven as god is exhausted and the remaining karman brings it back to earth. Otherwise it is difficult to explain the disparity between the new-borns' shapes and circumstances. Moreover, it is not possible to exhaust in one life the entire karman of the previous life. The soul is born with residual karman. It descends by the same path by which it ascended and with a difference too. All the commentators agree to the passage discussed as being the v.v. and the interpretation of the sūtra. The sūtra clearly incorporates in its body the words यथेतम् of the passage.

The second sūtra is चरणादिति चेन्नोपलक्षणार्थेति कार्ष्णाजिनिः। (3-1-9) If it be said that a new birth is on account of goodness of conduct, it is not so for Kārṣṇājini thinks, that the word caraṇa is intended to signify the remainder of works. The sūtra quotes an opinion of Kārṣṇajini. If it be said that conduct and not residual karman determines the new birth, the sūtra denies the view. The word conduct is used in the sense of residual karman. The sūtra continues the discussion of the passage quoted in the previous sūtra.

The third sūtra is आनर्थक्यमिति चेन्न तदपेक्षत्वात्। (3-1-10) If it be said that the śruti dealing with caraṇa will serve no purpose, (we reply that) it is not so, on account of the dependence of works on that conduct. Good conduct determines karman and is therefore not purposeless. The Vedas do not purify one who is devoid of good conduct आचारहीनं न पुनन्ति वेदा:। (Vasiṣṭha smṛti 6-3) But as work is the cause of new births, we need not assume that conduct is the cause.

The fourth sūtra is सुकृतदुष्कृते एवेति तु बादरि:। (3-1-11) But the conduct means only good and evil works, thus thinks Bādari. According to Bādari, the word caraṇa signify both good and bad deeds. So the residual karman is the determining cause of a new birth on earth.

Aniṣṭādikāryādhikaraṇam (3-1-12 to 21)

This adhikaraṇa, according to Śaṅkara, has the following ten sūtras viz.

(i) अनिष्टादिकारिणामपि च श्रुतम्। (3-1-12)

(ii) संयमने त्वनुभूयेतरेषामारोहावरोहौ तद्गतिदर्शनात्। (3-1-13)

(iii) स्मरन्ति च। (3-1-14)

(iv) अपि च सप्त। (3-1-15)

(v) तत्रापि च तद्व्यापारदविरोध:। (3-1-16)

(vi) विद्याकर्मणोरिति तु प्रकृतत्वात्। (3-1-17)

(vii) न तृतीये तथोपलब्धे:। (3-1-18)

(viii) स्मर्यतेऽपि च लोके। (3-1-19)

(ix) दर्शनाच्च। (3-1-20)

(x) तृतीयशब्दावरोध: संशोकजस्य। (3-1-21)

Regarding the general import of the sūtras, Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja agree but their arrangement is different. Śaṅkara considers the first sūtra of the adhikaraṇa as presenting the pūrvapakṣa and the rest are siddhāntasūtras. Rāmānuja regards sūtras 12-16 as stating the pūrvapakṣa and the remaining as siddhānta sūtras. Madhva regards sūtras 12-14 as forming one adhikaraṇa, 15, 16 and 17 as forming three separate adhikaraṇas and the rest 18-21 as one adhikaraṇa. Vallabha regards sūtras 12-16 as forming one adhikaraṇa and with the sūtra 17 begins a new adhikaraṇa. Nimbārka follows Rāmānuja.

Hitherto it has been established that Iṣṭādikārins go to the world of man. Now what about those who have not performed good works and sacrifices? According to Śaṅkara, the first sūtra is of pūrvapakṣa. According to pūrvapakṣa, even those who do not perform good works in life go upto the world of moon as stated in the Upaniṣad ये वै के चास्माल्लोकात्प्रत्यन्ति चन्द्रमसमेव ते सर्वे गच्छन्ति। (Kau. U. 1-2) All those who depart from this world go to the moon. Hence all creatures must be supposed to resort to the moon.

The second sūtra negatives the position, and states the siddhānta. The sūtra is संयमने त्वनुभूयेतरेषामारोहावरोहौ तद्गति दर्शनात्। (3-1-13) But of others (i.e. those who have not performed sacrifices) after having experienced the fruits of their actions in the abode of Yama, ascent and descent take place as such a course is declared by the scripture. The sūtra rejects the suggestion made in the previous sūtra. Evil-doers do not go to heaven, they go to the world of Yama, where they experience the results of their actions and then descend again to the earth. Scripture states न सांपराय: प्रतिभाति बालं प्रमाद्यन्तं वित्तमोहेन मूढम् अयं लोको नास्ति पर इति मानी पुन: पुनर्वशमापद्यते मे। (Kaṭha U. 2-6) The other world never rises before the eyes of the careless child, deluded by the delusion of wealth. This is the world, he thinks, there is no other, thus he falls again and again under my sway. According to Śaṅkara, this is a siddhānta sūtra. *Tu* of the sūtra refutes the primafacie view.

Dr. Ghate writes, Śaṅkara has to understand the descent to Yama's world and ascent therefrom to this world which seems a bit farfetched especially when the question is regarding the ascent to and descent from the moon.'[1] Dr. Ghate seems to have misunderstood the position stated by Śaṅkara. This is not warranted by Śāṅkarabhāṣya where he clearly says यामीयातना अनुभूय पुनरेवेमं लोकं प्रत्यवरोहन्ति। Having experienced the tortures of Yamaloka, again he descends to this very world.

The descent of the aniṣṭādikārins is from the world of Yama to this world.[2]

The next sūtra is स्मरन्ति च। (3-1-14) The smṛtis also declare this. That evil works are requited in Yama's world is declared by

1. Ghate V.S., Vedānta, p. 107
2. Sharma B.N.K., Vol. II p. 418

Manu, Vyāsa and others. Rāmānuja quotes from the Viṣṇupurāṇa. सर्वे चैते वशं यान्ति यमस्य भगवन्किल. (V.P. 3-7-5). O revered one, all these come under the sway of Yama indeed.

The fourth sūtra is अपि च सप्त (3-1-15) Moreover, there are seven hells. There are seven hells mentioned in the purāṇas to which the evil-doers go to experience the results of their evil deeds.

The fifth sūtra is तत्रापि च तद्व्यापारादविरोधः। (3-1-16) And on account of this activity there also, there is no contradiction. An objection may be raised that in different hells there are different persons like Citragupta and others in control. This is negatived by the sūtra by stating that even these different controllers are directed by Yama.

The next sūtra is विद्याकर्मणोरिति तु प्रकृतत्वात्। (3-1-17) But the reference is to the two roads of knowledge and work, this we understand on account of their being the subject under discussion. The scriptural passage states अथैतयोः पथोर्न कतरेण च तानीमानि क्षुद्राण्यसकृदावर्तीनि भूतानि भवन्ति। जायस्व म्रियस्वेत्येतत्तृतीयं स्थानं तेनासौ लोको न संपूर्यते। (C.U. 5-10-8) On neither of these two ways are those small creatures continually returning of whom it may be said, live and die. Theirs is a third place. Therefore the world never becomes full. The evil doers go to this third place. The Kau.U. text that all go to the world of moon refers only to those who have performed good deeds and not to evil-doers.

The next sūtra is न तृतीये तथोपलब्धेः। (3-1-18)

Not in the case of the third place for so it is seen. If it be said that all must go to the moon for the purpose of obtaining a new body to complete the fire-oblations that cause the new birth, the sūtra says that this specification does not apply to evil-doers, who are born irrespective of the oblations.

The next sūtra is स्मर्यतेऽपि च लोके। (3-1-19) And it is moreover declared by Smṛti and also heard of in the world. Cases of birth, without the completion of the five oblations are recorded. The bodies of some specially meritorious persons like Draupadi, Sītā are formed independently of the fifth oblation.

The next sūtra is दर्शनाच्च। (3-1-20) Also, on account of observation. The rule about five oblations is not universal. There are four forms of life viz. viviparous (जरायुज), oviparous (अण्डज),

springing from moisture (स्वेदज), and plant-life (उद्भिज्ज). The last two are born without any mating and there is no fifth oblation in their case.

Rāmānuja takes the word दर्शनात् in the sense of scriptures. He quotes the C.U. तेषां खल्वेषां भूतानि त्रीण्येव बीजानि भवन्ति। अण्डं जीरमुद्भिज्जम्। (C.U. 6-3-1) Of those indeed, of these beings, there are three seeds only, born of the egg, born of the living jīva, born of the earth. In view of the next sūtra considering the C.U. passage, it is better to take it here in the sense of scriptures.

The last sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is तृतीयशब्दावरोधः संशोकजस्य। (3-1-21) The third term plant-life includes that which springs from moisture, C.U. speaks only of three modes of origin, अण्डजं जीवमुद्भिज्जम्। (C.U. 6-3-1) Born of the egg, born of the living Jīva, born of the earth. How then can it be maintained that there are four forms of life? The answer is provided in the sūtra. That which springs from moisture is included in plant-life, since they both germinate, one from the earth, and the other from water.

Thus sinners do not go to the world of the moon.

Thus it will be observed that the adhikaraṇa's topic of discussion is the posthumous state of the aniṣṭādikarin and hence, relevant passages from the scriptures form the v.v.s of the individual sūtras.

Sābhāvyāpattyadhikaraṇam (3-1-22)

The adhikaraṇa has a sole sūtra साभाव्यापत्तिरुपपत्तेः (3-1-22) The soul when descending from the moon attains similarity of nature with them (i.e. ether, air and the rest) that alone being reasonable.

There is a passage from the C.U. अथैतमेवाध्वानं पुनर्निवर्तन्ते यथेतमाकाशमाकाशाद्वायुं वायुर्भूत्वा धूमो भवति धूमो भूत्वाऽभ्रं भवत्यभ्रं भूत्वा मेघो भवति मेघो भूत्वा प्रवर्षति। (C.U. 5-10-5) They return again the way they came, to the ether, from ether to the air. Then the sacrificer having become air becomes smoke, having become smoke, he becomes mist, having become mist, he becomes a cloud, having become a cloud, he rains down. The doubt is raised whether these souls attain identity of nature or likeness or similarity of nature. It cannot be the former, a thing cannot become one of a different nature. The first sūtra is अन्याधिष्ठितेषु पूर्ववदभिलापात्। (3-1-24) The descending souls enter into plants etc. occupied by other souls as

in the previous cases, on account of scriptural declaration. C.U. further states

त इह व्रीहियवाओषधिवनस्पतयस्तिल माषा इति जायन्ते। (C.U. 5-10-6)

Then they are born as rice and corn, herbs and trees, sesamum and beans. Here the question is whether the souls to which the residue of works clings really pass over into different species of those immovable things and enjoy their pleasures and pains or they enter merely into a state of conjunction with the bodies of their plants which are inhabited by other different souls. The sūtra says that the word 'born' implies mere connection with these plants. They (souls) enter these plants independently of their karma and while there, tney do not experience the results of their actions.

The second sūtra is अशुद्धमिति चेन्न शब्दात्। (3-1-25) If it be said that sacrifical work is, to some extent, impure because it involves injury to animals and so souls who have committed such evil deeds may be born as herbs etc. passage means is that the souls attain similarity of nature. If the souls become identified with ether, they could no longer descend through air etc.

Nāticirādhikaraṇam (3-1-23)

The adhikaraṇa has only one sūtra नातिचिरेण विशेषात्। (3-1-23) The soul passes through the stages of descent in a not very long time on account of the special statement. The descent through different states takes place quickly अतो वै खलु दुर्निष्प्रपतरम्। (C.U. 5-10-6) From thence the escape is beset with more pain. This statement implies that the escape from the previous states was comparatively easy and pleasant, that is to say quick, because it is not proper to talk of any kind of enjoyment in the absence of a gross body.

Anyādhiṣṭhitādhikaraṇam (3-1-24) The last adhikaraṇa has the following four sūtras :

(i) अन्याधिष्ठितेषु पूर्ववदभिलापात्। (3-1-24)

(ii) अशुद्धामिति चेन्न शब्दात्। (3-1-25)

(iii) रेतः सिग्योगोऽथ। (3-1-26)

(iv) योनेः शरीरम्। (3-1-27)

The sūtra refutes this view on the ground that the scripture is our authority for determining what is right and what is wrong. If

it be argued that the scripture also states that we should not hurt any creature, it is said in answer that that is a general rule and other scriptural injunctions give the exceptions. So the souls descending from the moon are not born as plants but are only associated with them.

The third sūtra is रेत: सिग्योगौऽथ। (3-1-26) After that the connection with him who performs the act of generation. C.U. further states यो यो ह्यन्नमत्ति यो रेत: सिञ्चति तद्भूय एव भवति। (5-10-6) For whoever eats the food, whoever performs the act of generation, that again he becomes. Here the soul's 'becoming' he who performs the act of generation cannot be taken in its literal sense, for a person becomes capable of generation only a long time after his birth i.e. when he reaches an age of puberty. Hence, we must interpret the passage to mean only that the soul enters into conjunction with one who performs the act of generation as the soul's becoming plant is simply entering into conjunction with a plant.

The last sūtra of the adhikaraṇa and pāda is योने: शरीरम्। (3-1-27) From the womb, the new body. Till now, it was only conjunction with successive states. Only after reaching the womb, there is the body by those with the residue of karman. Therefore prior to it, it is only a conjunction.

Thus it will be noticed that, the first pāda of the third adhyāya deals with the state or states of transmigatory soul and hence, there is not much scope for any controversy among the commentators regarding the v.v.s. Some of the scriptural statements are quoted and they serve as v.v.s and an attempt of reconciling these statements is made. But these are eschatological speculations, having not much of a bearing on the core of the philosophical positions.

Second pāda (3-2-1 to 41)

Sandhyādhikaraṇam (3-2-1 to 6)

With this adhikaraṇa, the second pāda begins. After having described the course of the transmigratory soul in the first pāda of the third adhyāya, the sūtrakāra now proceeds to discuss the nature of the different states such as dreaming and sleeping of the soul.

The first adhikaraṇa has the following six sūtras.

(i) सन्ध्ये सृष्टिराह हि। (3-2-1)

(ii) निर्मातारं चैके पुत्रादयश्च। (3-2-2)

(iii) मायामात्रं तु कात्स्न्र्येनानभिव्यक्तस्वरूपत्वात्। (3-2-3)

(iv) सूचकश्च हि श्रुतेराचक्षते च तद्विदः। (3-2-4)

(v) पराभिध्यानात्तु तिरोहितं ततो ह्यस्य बन्धविपर्ययौ। (3-2-5)

(vi) देहयोगाद्वा सोऽपि। (3-2-7)

The first sūtra of the adhikaraṇas सन्ध्ये सृष्टिराह हि। (3-2-1) In the intermediate state between waking and deep sleep there is creation because the scripture says so. Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja, Vailabha and other commentators, though differing in their interpretations, take the first two sūtras as stating the primafacie view. Their v.v. is also identical and Madhva also agrees as to the v.v. being from the B.U. in which the word सन्ध्य occurs. तस्य वा एतस्य पुरुषस्य तस्य वा एतस्य पुरुषस्य द्वे एव स्थाने भवत इदञ्च परलोक स्थानञ्च सन्ध्यं तृतीयं स्वप्नस्थानं तस्मिन्सन्ध्ये स्थाने तिष्ठन्नेते उभे स्थाने पश्यन्तींदञ्च परलोकस्थानञ्च। (B.U. 4-3-9, 10) Verily there are just two states of this person this world and the state of being in the other world. There is an intermediate third state, that of being in sleep (dream). By standing in this intermediate state one sees both these states, of being in this world and of being in the other world.

The opponent states that the dreamstate is just as real as the waking state.

This sūtra has got a very clear-cut v.v. as the sūtra itself incorporates a word (सन्ध्य) from the passage intended to be the v.v.

The pūrvapakṣa continues in the second sūtra

निर्मातारं चैके पुत्रादयश्च। (3-2-2) And some schools state the self to be the shaper, sons and so on. Reference is to the passage from the Kaṭha U. य एषु सुप्तेषु जागर्ति कामं कामं पुरुषो निर्मिमाणः। तदेव शुक्रं तद्ब्रह्म तदेवामृतमुच्यते। तस्मिंल्लोकाः श्रिताः सर्वे तदुनात्येति कश्चन। (Kaṭha U. 5-8)

He, the person, who is awake in us while we are asleep, shaping one lovely thing after another. That indeed is the Bright, that Brahman, that alone is called the Immortal. All worlds are contained in it and no one goes beyond. So the pūrvapakṣa contends, as in the case of the waking state, even in dreams the

Lord is the creator. So the world of dreams is real like the empirical world.

As noted above, for Rāmānuja and Vallabha the first two sūtras form the pūrvapakṣa while for Madhva, they are the part of the siddhānta and the relevant pūrvapakṣa can as well be put up from outside the sūtras.'[1]

The third sūtra is मायामात्रं तु कात्स्न्येनानभिव्यक्तस्वरूपत्वात्। (3-2-3) But the dreamworld is mere appearance on account of its nature not being manifest with the totality of attributes of the waking state. The sūtra merely makes a logical statement and hence, there is no v.v. though the commentators differ among themselves as to the interpretation of the word मायामात्रम् and the sūtra as well.[2]

The fourth sūtra is सूचकश्च हि श्रुतेराचक्षते च तद्विदः। (3-2-4) The dream is indicative of the future according to śruti, those who are versed in that also declare so.

Vallabha paraphrases the word सूचकः as शुभाशुभफलसूचको भवति स्वप्नः। Dream is indicative of the good and bad results. There is a śrutipassage to this effect.

यदा कर्मसु काम्येषु स्त्रियं स्वप्नेषु पश्यति।
समृद्धिं तत्र जानीयात्तस्मिन्स्वप्ननिदर्शने।। (C.U. 5-2-9)

When a man engaged to undertake a desirable work, happens to see a woman in his dreams, he may infer success from that dream-vision.

The fifth sūtra is पराभिध्यानात्तु तिरोहितं ततो ह्यस्य बन्धविपर्ययौ। (3-2-5) But by meditation on the Highest, that which is hidden for it is from Him, result the soul's bondage and release. अभिध्यान meaning meditation is an extension of the meaning reflecting in which sense, the word अभिध्यान was used in the sūtra तदभिध्यानादेव तु तल्लिङ्गात्सः। (2-3-13) If this extension of the meaning is consistent, then, the अभिध्यान may also mean 'will'. Then the sūtra may be translated with a little more clarity added. But by the will of the Highest that which remains hidden, for it is from Him, result the soul's bondage and release. If this is acceptable, then, Śaṅkara's v.v. should become acceptable. Śaṅkara cites from the S.U.

1. Sharma B.N.K., Vol. III, p. 36
2. Vide Ghate V.S., Vedānta, p. 111

ज्ञात्वा देवं सर्वपाशापहानिः क्लेशैर्जन्ममृत्युप्रहाणिः। तस्याभिध्यानात्तृतीयं देहभेदे विश्वैश्वर्यं केवलाप्तकामः ।। (S.U. 1-11)

By knowing God, there is a falling off of all fetters, when the sufferings are destroyed, there is cessation of birth and death. By meditating (reflecting) on Him there is the third state, on the dissolution of the body, universal lordship, being alone, his desire is fulfilled.

It is also worthnoting that, the word (which is a part of the sūtra) also occurs in the previous verse of the S.U.

क्षरं प्रधानममृताक्षरं हरः क्षरात्मानावीशते देव एकः।
तस्याभिध्याद्योजनातत्त्वभावाद्भूयश्चान्ते विश्वमायानिवृत्तिः ।। (S.U. 1-10)

What is perishable is the pradhāna. What is immortal and imperishable is Hara (the Lord). Over both the perishable and the soul the one God rules. By meditating on Him, by uniting with Him, by reflecting on His being more and more, there is complete cessation from the illusion of the world.

Another remarkable feature of this verse is that the word माया occurs in this verse which forms a part (मायामात्रम्) of the sūtra 3-2-5. So considering all these factors the S.U. 1-10,11 should form the v.v. of this sūtra. It is rather strange that the commentators like Rāmānuja and Vallabha have interpreted the sūtra in the manner of Śaṅkara[1] , but they have refrained from citing the S.U. passage or any other passage for that matter as a v.v.

Madhva takes this sūtra as a separate adhikaraṇa, stating that the world of dreams is made to disappear also through the will of the Supreme Being. बन्धमोक्षप्रदत्वात् स एव स्वप्नतिरस्कर्ता। Baladeva says that the dream objects are withdrawn by the wish of the lord alone. 'He who can cause the bondage and release of the soul, can easily bring about the dream and its withdrawl for the soul.'[2]

The sixth sūtra is देहयोगाद्वा सोऽपि। (3-2-6) Or that the concealment of the soul's powers also results from its connection with the body. Though the soul is not different from the Lord, its

---

1. (i) परमपुरुषसंकल्पात् अस्य जीवस्य स्वाभाविकं रूपं तिरोहितम्। Śrībhāṣya by Rāmānuja. (ii) तस्मादीश्वरेच्छया जीवस्य भगवद्धर्म तिरोभावः।
2. The Vedāntasūtras of Bādarāyaṇa with the commentary of Baladeva, Tr. by Rai Bahadur Srisachandra Vasu.

powers remain hidden because of limiting adjuncts such as connection with the body.

Tadabhāvādhikaraṇam (3-2-7, 8)

This adhikaraṇa consists of the two sūtras viz.

(i) तदभावो नाडीषु तच्छ्रुतेरात्मनि च। (3-1-7)

(ii) अत: प्रबोधोऽस्मात्। (3-2-8)

The first sūtra is तदभावो नाडीषु तच्छ्रुतेरात्मनि च। (3-2-7) The absence of that i.e. of dreams takes place in the nāḍīs and in the self, according to scripture. The self in dreamless sleep is said variously to reside in the arteries (nāḍīs) pericardium (purītat) and in Brahman. The question is whether these places are naturally exclusive or not. Pūrvapakṣa maintains that any one of them is to be accepted as the resort of the self in sleep. The sūtra holds that the places enumerated are not alternatives but stand in mutual relation and refer to one place only. It is said at one place तद्यत्रैतत्सुप्त: समस्त: संप्रसन्न: स्वप्नं न विजानात्यासु तदा नाडीषु सुप्तो भवति। (C.U. 8-6-3)

When a man is asleep, reposing and at perfect rest, so that he sees no dreams, then he has entered into those nāḍis. Then at another place ताभि: प्रत्यवसृप्य पुरीतति शेते। (2-1-19)

Through them he moves and rests in the pericardium (puritat). Still at another place it is said य एषोऽन्तर्हृदय आकाशस्तस्मिंच्छेते। (B.U. 2-1-17) That ether which is within the heart, in that he reposes. An another place, प्राज्ञेनात्मना संपरिषवक्तो न बाह्यं किंचन वेद नान्तरम्। (B.U. 4-3-21)

Embraced by the Highest Self, he knows nothing that is without, nothing that is within. So there are more than one alternative. But these all alternatives stand in mutual relation, and refer to one place only. If we accept one of them, then the authors of the Veda suffer, for the acceptance of one means the denial of the other. So the statements should be combined, in this way. The soul gives through the nerves to the region of the heart and there rests in Brahman.

The second sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is नेत: प्रबोधोऽस्मात्। (3-2-8) Hence the awaking from that (viz. Brahman) Scriptures refer to the awaking from the self यथाग्ने: क्षुद्रा विस्फुलिङ्गा व्युच्चरन्त्येवमेवैतस्मादात्मन: सर्वे प्राणा:। (B.U. 2-1-20) As small sparks

come forth from fire, thus all prāṇas come from that self. सत आगम्य न विदु: सत आगच्छामहे। (C.U. 6-10-2) When they have come from the True, they do not know that they have come back from the True.

If there were optional places to which the soul might resort in deep sleep, scriptures would teach us that it awakes sometimes from the nāḍīs sometines from the pericardium, sometines from the self.

Karmānusmṛtiśabdavidhyadhikaraṇam (3-2-9)

Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja and Madhva accept an independent adhikaraṇa made up of only this one sūtra. The sūtra is स एव तु कर्मानुस्मृतिशब्दविधिभ्य: । (3-2-9)

But the same soul (returns from Brahman of deep sleep) on account of work, remembrance, scriptural authority, and injunction. The sūtra presents some reasoning based on sound common sense. There is a scriptural authority to strengthen the reasoning. त इह व्याघ्रो वा सिंहो वा वृको वा वराहो वा कीटो वा पतङ्गो वा दंशो वा मशको वा यद्यद्भवन्ति तदाभवन्ति। (C.U. 6-9-3) Whatever these creatures are here, whether a lion, or a wolf or a boar or a worm or a midge or a gnat or a mosquito that they become again and again.

Mugdherdhasampattyadhikaraṇam (3-2-10)

This adhikaraṇa also consists of one sūtra only i.e. मुग्धेऽर्धसम्पत्ति: परिशेषात्। (3-2-10) In the swooning person, there is half-attainment, on account of this remaining as the only possible hypothesis.

The sūtra deals with the swooning. According to B.N.K. Sharma,... commentators are fighting shy of accepting the ardhasampatti of the jīva in Brahman in the state of swoon expressly taught by the sūtrakāra in its literal sense and are trying to find ways and means of explaining it away as it suits their fancy.'[1]

Ubhayaliṅgādhikaraṇam (3-2-11 to 21)

Now we come to deal with that part which has elicited different opinions and interpretations from the commentators and scholars alike. While on the one hand P.M. Modi regards this

1. Sharma B.N.K., Vol. III, p. 87

portion as the 'most important portion of the Brahmasūtra'[1] Belvalkar suspects this portion as an 'interpolation'.[2] And on account of the variety of interpretations, Thibaut is constrained to remark 'whoever commentators we follow, we greatly miss coherence and strictness of reasoning and it is thus by no means improbable that the section is one of those-perhaps not few in number- in which both interpreters had less regard to the literal sense of the words and to tradition than their desire of forcing Bādarāyaṇa's sūtras to bear testimony to the truth of their own philosophic theories'[3]

Moreover, the distribution of the sūtras is also not uniform among the commentators, According to Śaṅkara, the sūtras from 3-2-11 to 21 form one adhikaraṇa while Rāmānuja has the adhikaraṇa formed of 3-2-11 to 25 and Madhava divided the sūtras 11-21 into five adhikaraṇas. A modern scholar P.M. Modi feels that the sūtras 11-19 form one adhikaraṇa.

As Śaṅkara himself informs us, some predecessor of Śaṅkara divided the sūtra into two adhikaraṇas one from 11 to 14 and the other from 15 to 21. According to Vallabha sūtras, 11 to 13 constitute one adhikaraṇa, 14 to 18 another, and 19 to 22 a third one.

Ubhayaliṅgādhikaraṇa consists of the following sūtras viz.

(i) न स्थानतोऽपि परस्योभयलिङ्गं सर्वत्र हि। (3-2-11)

(ii) न भेदादिति चेन्न प्रत्येकमतद्वचनात्। (3-2-12)

(iii) अपि चैवमेके। (3-2-13)

(iv) अरूपवदेव हि तत्प्रधानत्वात्। (3-2-14)

(v) प्रकाशवच्चावैयर्थ्यात्। (3-2-15)

(vi) आह च तन्मात्रम्। (3-2-16)

(vii) दर्शयति चाथो अपि स्मर्यते। (3-2-17)

(viii) अत एव चोपमा सूर्यकादिवत्। (3-2-18)

(ix) अम्बुदवदग्रहणात्तु न तथात्वम्। (3-2-19)

(x) वृद्धिह्रासभाक्त्वमन्तर्भावादुभयसामञ्जस्यादेवम्। (3-2-20)

(xi) दर्शनाच्च। (3-2-21)

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part II, Introduction, p. 4
2. Belvalkar S.K., Basu Mallik Lectures on Vedānta, p.144
3. Thibaut George, Vedānta Sūtras Part I, Introduction p. XCVI

The first sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is न स्थानतोऽपि परस्योभयलिङ्गं सर्वत्र हि (3-2-11)

Not an account of difference of place, also two fold characteristics can belong to the Highest for everywhere (scripture teaches it to be without any difference). According to Śaṅkara, this sūtra declares that the twofold characteristics of Brahman being saviśeṣa and nirviśeṣa cannot belong to the Highest Brahman for all passages describing the nature of Brahman declare it to be devoid of all distinctive qualities. In the śruti texts, we find passages referring to the qualified Brahman सर्वकर्मा सर्वकामः सर्वगन्धः सर्वरसः। (C.U. 3-14-2) and unqualified Brahman अस्थूलमनण्वह्रस्वमदीर्घम्। (C.U.3-8-8) too. The sūtras say that both these cannot be predicated of one and the same reality which cannot have two contradictory natures at the same time as it is opposed to experience. So of the two aspects of Brahman, we have to accept one viz. the non-qualified Brahman. The other description of Brahman is only for the sake of upāsanā or worship and it is not its real nature.

Rāmānuja would interpret the sūtra in this way 'not an account of place, even if there is any imperfection, in the Highest, for everywhere it is described as having two fold characteristics. Brahman has two fold nature, freedom from imperfections and possession of all auspicious qualities.

Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja and Vallabha interpret sthānataḥ as belonging to different places like earth etc. while Madhava interprets the word sthānataḥ as waking, dreaming and suṣupti states described in the Māṇḍukyopaniṣad.

Thibaut observes, 'The wording of the sūtra is so eminently concise and vague that I find it impossible to decide which of the two commentators (i.e. Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja) if indeed either is to be accepted as a trustworthy guide, regarding the sense of some sūtras, Śaṅkara's explanation seems to deserve preference, in case of others, Rāmānuja seems to keep closer to the text.'

P.M. Modi seems to be concurring with Madhva when he interprets sthāna as states such as जागरित, स्वप्न and सुषुप्ति. Accordingly his v.v. will be the passage referring to these sthānas from the Māṇḍukyopaniṣad.

जागरितस्थानो बहिः प्रज्ञः सप्ताङ्ग एकोनविंशतिमुखः स्थूलभुग्वैश्वानरः प्रथमः पादः।

स्वप्नस्थानोऽन्तः प्राज्ञः सप्ताङ्ग एकोनविंशतिमुखः प्रविविक्तभुक्तैजसो द्वितीयः पादः।

यत्र सुप्तो न कंचन कामं कामयते न कंचन स्वप्नं पश्यति तत्सुषुप्तम्। सुषुप्तस्थान एकीभूतः प्रज्ञानघन एवानन्दमयो ह्यानन्दभुक् चेतोमुखः प्राज्ञस्तृतीयपादः। (Ma.U. 1-3-, 4, 5)

The first quarter is Vaiśvānara whose sphere of activity is the waking state who cognises external objects, who has seven limbs and ninteen mouths and who enjoys gross material objects.

The second quarter is taijas whose sphere of activity is the dreamstate, who cognnises internal objects, who has seven limbs, and ninteen mouths, and who enjoys the subtle objects.

Where one, being fast asleep, does not desire any desire whatsoever, and does not see any dream whatsoever, that is deep sleep. The third quarter is prājña, whose sphere of activity is the state of deep sleep, who has become one, who is verily, a mass of cognition, who is full of bliss, and who enjoys bliss, whose face is thought.

P.M. Modi observes, 'If we interpret the word sthāna in this sense, we have not to suspect this discussion of the supreme self to be an interpolation because we can then, say that pāda II of adhyāya III deals with the states of the individual soul and those of the supreme soul.'[1]

It is difficult to take any side. The crux of the problem is the word sthāna. Śaṅkara and others interpret the word sthāna in the sense of pṛthivi and such places. Of course, Śaṅkara seems to have spoiled his case by adding the word Upādhi which, in fact, is not hinted at, in the sūtra.

Yāska, a niruktakāra, has divided the gods according to their connection with the places, and it would not be wrong to surmise that the sūtrakara might be having this division in mind when he says sthānataḥ. This surmise stands further corroborated by the sūtrakāra's division of Brahman into rūpavat and arūpavat, in this very adhikaraṇa. However, it should be mentioned in fairness that P.M. Modi has come to the opposite conclusion with the same data before him. He avers, 'In taking Brahman as possessed of

1. Modi P.M., The Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, p. 3

these two aspects arūpavat or apuruṣavidha and rūpavat or puruṣavidha the sūtrakāra seems to us to adopt or to follow a once - prevalent - Vedānta tradition, which had already adopted the same attitude regarding the nature or aspects of Brahman as was done by Yāska in respect of the nature or aspects of the devatās of the Ṛgveda. Our interpretation of the sūtra and the conclusion about the sūtrakara's view regarding the nature of Brahman arrived at by us differ widely from the same propounded by Śaṅkara, his predecessors and his followers. It is very likely that a doubt may be raised against our view on the ground that it is not corroborated by any Vedāntic tradition. We in reply submit that Yāska's view about the nature of deities supplies the source of the sūtrakāra's view about Brahman. Yāska also believed that it is one Ātman only who is praised in various ways. In any case, the sūtrakāra's view and that of Yāska are strikingly similar and therefore, deserve to be compared with each other for the historical development of the former's doctrine.'[1]

Yāska divides the gods according to their connection with the places. Similary the word sthāna should be interpreted. But it would be seen from the above somewhat long quotation, that P.M. Modi comes to a different conclusion.

Moreover, it is also noteworthy that Belvalkar though opining that the sūtra can only be interpreted in the manner of Śaṅkara'[2] the meaning of the word sthāna, according to him, is to be understood in conformity with the context of the Upaniṣadic passage which is selected for discussion in the present and the preceeding adhikaraṇas and which seems to speak of the states of dreaming, sound-sleep and waking as three sthānas of the soul.'[3]

Is not the learned scholar contradicting himself or ambivalent?

However, looking at the general drift of the sūtras and keeping in view the context of the immediately preceeding sūtras, it seems very likely that the meaning of the word sthāna is the state as discussed in the Māṇḍukya Upaniṣad. So the v.v. of the

---

1. Modi P.M., The Critique of the Brahmasūtra Part I, pp. 13-14
2. Belvalkar S.K., Basu Mallik Lectures on Vedānta, p. 29
3. Ibid p. 165

sūtras will be as quoted earlier, the passages 3,4, and 5 of the Mā.U.

The second sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is न भेदादिति चेन्न प्रत्येकमतद्वचनात्। (3-2-12) If it be said that it is not so on account of difference (taught in the scripture) we reply not so, because with respect to each such form the scripture declares the opposite of that. Rāmānuja omits na at the beginning and reads, 'If it be said 'On account of difference' we say it is not so, because with reference to each the text says what is not, that.' Belvalkar observes, 'In sūtra 12, it seems clear that 'atat' should mean 'abheda.' Rāmānuja and Nimbārka get the sense desired by them only by omitting the word 'na' in the sūtra.'[1]

The third sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is अपि, चैवमेके। (3-2-13) Some also teach thus. Śaṅkara explains that some Śākhās or recensions of the Vedas teach that the manifoldness is not true for they denigrate those who see difference मनसैवेदमाप्तव्यं नेह नानास्ति किंचन। मृत्योः स मृत्युमाप्नोति य इह नानेव पश्यति॥ (K.U. 4-11)

According to Rāmānuja this sūtra states the objection. The connection with one and the same body is for the individual soul a source of disadvantage while for the Highest Brahman, it is an additional glory in so far as it manifests Him as a Lord and ruler. And he quotes from the M.U.

द्वा सुपर्णा सयुजा सखाया समानं वृक्षं परिषस्वजाते।
तयोरन्यः पिप्पलं स्वाद्वत्त्यनश्नन्नन्योऽभिचाकशीति॥ (M.U. 3-1-1)

Two birds, companions (who are) always united cling to the self same tree. Of these two, the one eats the sweet fruit and the other looks on without eating.

According to P.M. Modi, the reference is 'probably' to S.U.

सर्वतः पाणिपादं तत्सर्वतोऽक्षिशिरोमुखम्।
सर्वतः श्रुतिमल्लोके सर्वमावृत्य तिष्ठति॥
सर्वेन्द्रियगुणाभासं सर्वेन्द्रियविवर्जितम्।
सर्वस्य प्रभुमीशानं सर्वस्य शरणं सुहृत्॥
अपाणिपादो जवनो ग्रहीता पश्यत्यचक्षुः स शृणोत्यकर्णः॥
स वेत्ति वेद्यं न च तस्यास्ति वेत्ता तमाहुरग्र्यं पुरुषं महान्तम्॥

1. Belvalkar S.K., Basu Mallik Lectures on Vedānta,.p. 165

अणोरणीयान् महतो महीयान्...।

On every side, it has a hand and a foot, on every side an eye, a head and a face. It has an ear everywhere. It stands encompassing all in the world. Reflecting the qualities of all the senses and yet devoid of all the senses, it is the Lord and ruler, it is the great refuge of all. Without foot or hand, (yet) swift and grasping, he sees without eyes, he hears without ear. He knows whatever is to be known, of him there is none who knows. They call him 'the Primeval, the Supreme Person. Subtler than the subtle, Greater than the great...

According to P.M. Modi, the śrutis quoted by Śaṅkara are out of place here.[1]

The fourth sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is अरूपवदेव हि तत्प्रधानत्वात्। (3-2-15) For Brahman is merely devoid of form, on account of his being the main purport of scripture.

Since some texts represent Brahman as having form and others as without form, how can one assert that Brahman is without form. The sūtra gives the answer. Brahman is formless. For if it had form, the texts which teach it as being without form would become purposeless. Those which deal with Brahman as having form are meant for meditation : Upāsanāvidhi-pradhānāni.

Rāmānuja points out that though Brahman enters into bodies, human and divine, it is itself without form and is therefore not subject to karman, which is so in the case of individual soul's embodiedness.

Belvalkar considers Rāmānuja's way of explaining the sūtra as 'altogether unsatisfactory.' He proposes to interpret these three sūtras in such a way that sūtrakāra would agree in admitting both the saviśeṣa and the nirviśeṣa aspects of Brahman, assigning the palm of superiority to the nirviśeṣa Brahman. Belvalkar further observes,

'The rūpavat or qualitative description of the Highest Self whereever it occurs is subordinate to the arūpa or negative description which is the primary intention of the śruti...[2]

---

1. Modi P.R., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, pp. 10-11
2. Belvalkar S.K., Basu Mallik lectures on Vedānta, p. 165. Further in a footnote he adds, 'If arūpavat is understood as predicated of

The fifth sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is प्रकाशवच्चावैयर्थ्यात्। (3-2-15) And as light assumes forms by its contact with objects having forms, so does Brahman, because the texts ascribing form to Brahman are not without meaning. This sūtra makes a point with the help of an illustration, and hence, it need not have a v.v.

The sixth sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is आह च तन्मात्रम्। (3-2-16) And the scripture declares, Brahman consists of that intelligence only. Śaṅkara quotes from the B.U. to point out vilaksaṇarūpāntara rahitam nirviśeṣam Brahma.

स यथा सैन्धवघनोऽनन्तरोऽबाह्यः कृत्स्नो रसघन एवैनं अरेऽयमात्माऽनन्तरोऽबाह्यः कृत्स्नः प्रज्ञानघन एव। (B.U. 4-5-13)

As a mass of salt is without inside, without outside, is altogether a mass of taste, even so verily is this self without inside, without outside, altogether a mass of intelligence only. Having arisen out of these elements, the self vanishes again in them. When he has departed there is no more consciousness.

Rāmānuja interprets this sūtra to mean that the text says 'so much only', that Brahman has light for its essential nature. This does not negative the other attributes of Brahman as omniscience being the cause of the world and so on. To V.S. Ghate, the meaning of tanmātra, given by Rāmānuja is 'rather unfamilar the meaning given by Śaṅkara being no doubt, the more usual one'[1]

To P.M. Modi, the sūtra, in the context of the previous sūtra, refers to, Brahman to be light only and hence the śruti would be अथायमशरीरोऽमृतः प्राणो ब्रह्मैव तेज एव। (B.U. 4-4-7) Or this prāṇa without any body, immortal is the very Brahman, light only or the śruti in question may be C.U. 3-14-2 (भारूपः...) in which Brahman is declared to be भारूप of the form of brilliance.[2]

Belvalkar writes 'the lamps, or lights constitute just one essence, are light pure and simple, just as Brahman is ultimately describable only as the 'mere that '[3]

Brahman (the subject), then 'tat' cannot be the word intended to refer to Brahman, we should expect 'sva' instead, p. 166

1. Ghate V.S., The Vedānta, p. 116
2. Modi P.M. A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, p. 18
3. Belvlkar S.K., Basu Mallik Lectures on Vedānta, p. 166

The seventh sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is दर्शयति चाथो अपि स्मर्यते। (3-2-17) This scripture also shows and thus it is also stated in the Smṛtis. Śaṅkara maintains that non-differenced Brahman is mentioned in scriptural texts. अथात आदेशो नेति नेति। (B.U. 2-3-6) Thence, follows teaching by No No. He quotes from the Gītā

ज्ञेयं यत्तत्प्रवक्ष्यामि यज्ज्ञात्वाऽमृतमश्नुते।

अनादिमत्परं ब्रह्म न सत् नासदुच्यते।। (B.G. 13-12)

'I will proclaim that which is the object of knowledge, knowing which one reaches immortality, the highest Brahman without either beginning or end, which cannot be said either to be or not to be.'

According to P.M. Modi दर्शयति probably refers to such a śruti as

न तत्र सूर्यो भाति न चन्द्रतारकं नेमा विद्युता भान्ति कुतोऽयमग्निः।

तमेव भान्तमनुभाति सर्वं तस्य भासा सर्वमिदं विभाति।। (M.U. 2-2-10)

The sun does not shine there, nor the moon, and the stars, nor these lightnings much less this fire. After him, when he shines everything shines, by His Light all this is illumined. According to P.M. Modi, this refers to

यदादित्यगातं तेजो जगद्भासयतेऽखिलम्।

यच्चन्द्रमसि यच्चाग्नौ तत्तेजो विद्धि मामकम्।। (B.G. 15-12).

That light of the sun illuminates the whole world, that of the moon and whatever is that of fire, know that light is mine.

The eighth sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is अत एव चोपमा सूर्यकादिवत्। (3-2-18). For this very reason also, there are applied to Brahman comparisons such as the images of the sun and the like.

Śaṅkara maintains that the different forms of Brahman who is free from all differentiation are comparable to the images of the sun reflected in the water and the like.

He cites two passages containing the comparison in the water यथा ह्ययं ज्योतिरात्मा विवस्वानपो भिन्ना बहुधेकोऽनुगच्छन्। उपाधिना क्रियते भेदरूपो देवः क्षेत्रेष्वेवमजोऽयमात्मा। (Yājñavalkya Smṛti 3-143-4) As the one luminous sun when entering into relation to many different waters is himself rendered multiform by its limiting adjuncts, so also the one divine unborn self. Again

एक एव हि भूतात्मा भूते भूते व्यवस्थितः।

एकधा बहूधा चैव दृश्यते जलचन्द्रवत्।। (Brahmabindu U. 12)

The one self of all beings separately abides in all the individual beings, hence it appears as one and many at the same time, just as the one moon is multiplied by its reflections in the water.

P.M. Modi suggests such passages in which Brahman is compared to the sun and other lustrous objects.

सूर्यो यथा सर्वलोकस्य चक्षुर्न लिप्यते चक्षुषैबांह्यदोषै:।
एकस्तथा सर्वभूतान्तरात्मा न लिप्यते लोकदु:खेन बाह्य:।।
अग्निर्यथैको भुवनं प्रविष्टो रूपं रूपं प्रतिरूपो बभूव।
एकस्तथा सर्वभूतान्तरात्मा रूपं रूपं प्रतिरूपो बहिश्च।।

(Kaṭha 3-2-11, 9)

Just as the sun, the eye of the whole world is not defiled by the external faults, seen by the eye, even so, the one within all beings is not tainted by the sorrow of the world, as He is outside the world.

As fire, which is one, entering this world, becomes varied in shape, according to the object (it burns), so also the one self within all beings becomes varied according to whatever (it enters) and also exists outside (them also).

And

तदेतत्सत्यं यथा सुदीप्तात्पावकाद्विस्फुलिङ्गा: सहस्रश: प्रभवन्ते सरूपा:।
तथाक्षराद्विविधान् सौम्य भावा: प्रजायन्ते चैवापि यन्ति।। (M.U. 3-1-1)

This is the truth. As from a blazing fire, sparks of like form issue forth by the thousands, even so O beloved, many kinds of beings issue forth from the immutable and they return there too.

According to P.M. Modi, the sūtra refers to these texts not to demonstrate the निर्लेपत्व, व्यापकत्व, etc. of Brahman, but to show that Brahman is like light because it is compared with the sun, the fire etc.[1]

The ninth sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is अम्बुवदग्रहणात्तु न तथात्वम्। (3-2-19) But there is similarity of the things compared, since, in the case of Brahman, there is no apprehension of any separate substance like water.

1. Vide, Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, p. 19

According to Śaṅkara, this is a sūtra raising an objection, while, according to P.M. Modi this sūtra answers the objection raised in the previous three sūtras.

According to Śaṅkara, the sūtra raises an objection that, in the case of the sun and the other luminous bodies, there is a separate material substance occupying a different place i.e. water. So the light of the sun is reflected. The self on the other hand is not a material being, It is present everywhere and there is nothing different from it. So there is no similarity between the two.

While refraining from entering into the interpretational labryinths, we would remark that this sūtra, having an illustration, does not have any v.v. as on the previous similar occasions.

The tenth sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is वृद्धिह्रासभावत्व-मन्तर्भावादुभयसामञ्जस्यादेवम्। (3-2-20) Since the Highest

Brahman is inside of the limiting manifestations, it participates in their increase and decrease, owing to the appropriateness of the two cases, it is thus (the comparison is not defective).

The last sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is दर्शनाच्च। (3-2-21) And on account of the declaration of scripture. According to Śaṅkara, darśanāt refers to a śruti in which the entrance (अन्तर्भाव) of परब्रह्म into the body etc. is mentioned. अनेन जीवेनात्मनाऽनुप्रविश्य। (C.U. 6-3-2).

Having entered into them with this living self.

According to P.M. Modi, 'This sūtra gives a reference to a śruti in which अन्तर्भाव of Brahman is mentioned in order to explain ब्रह्मण: वृद्धिह्रासभाक्तत्वम्। Such a śruti to us (i.e. P.M. Modi) to be तस्य ह वा एतस्यैव पश्यत एवं मन्वानस्यैवं विजानत: आत्मत: प्राण आत्मत आशात्मत: स्मर आत्मत: आकाश आत्मतेज आत्मत आप आत्मत आविर्भावतिरोभावात्मतोऽन्नमात्मतो बलमात्मतो विज्ञानात्मतो ध्यानमात्मतश्चित्तमात्मत: संकल्प आत्मतो मन आत्मतो वागात्मतो नामात्मतो मन्त्रा आत्मत: कर्माण्यात्मत एवेदं सर्वमिति। (C.U. 7-26-1)

For him who sees this, who thinks this, and who understands this, life breath springsfrom the self, hope from the self, memory from the self, ether from the self, heat from the self, water from the self, appearance and disappearance from the self, food from the self, strength from the self, understanding from the self, meditation from the self, thought from the self, determination from the self, mind from the self, speech from the self, sacred

hymns from the self, works from the self, indeed all this from the self.

A point may be noted regarding the interpretation offered by P.M. Modi of some sūtras. The word in the sūtra प्रकाशवत् (प्रकाशवच्चावैयर्थ्यात् 3-2-15) is explained by P.M. Modi as like light, that is an illustration of light. If it is to be taken as an illustration or as a point of comparison, then, it is difficult to understand that the next sūtra (तन्मात्रम् 3-2-16) should mean, as P.M. Modi understands : it is only light. The thing which was cited by way of an illustration cannot constitute in the next sūtra itself as the very essence of the thing. It is taxing the credulity of the reader, sacrificing the logic and going against the drift of the sūtras. The adhikaraṇa further gives illustrations of सूर्यक (अत एव चोपमा सूर्यकादिवत्। 3-2-18), अम्बु (अम्बुवदग्रहणात्तु न तथात्वम् 3-2-19) and the same illustration is explicated in the sūtra 20 वृद्धिह्रासभाक्त्वमन्तर्भावादुभयसामञ्जस्यादेवम्। (3-2-20). We think that the identity between the दृष्टान्त and दार्ष्टान्तिक is intended by the sūtrakāra. And perhaps. Brahman is light is not the topic of discussion.

But all this without entering into the intricacies of the philosophical interpretations.

Prakṛtaitāvattvādhikaraṇam (3-2-22 to 30)

This adhikaraṇa, according to Śaṅkara, (other commentators have quite different arrangements) has the following sūtras :

(i) प्रकृतैतावत्त्वं हि प्रतिषेधति ततो ब्रवीति च भूयः। (3-2-22)

(ii) तदव्यक्तमाह हि। (1-2-23)

(iii) अपि च संराधने प्रत्यक्षानुमानाभ्याम्। (1-2-24)

(iv) प्रकाशादिवच्चावैशेष्यं प्रकाशश्च कर्मण्यभ्यासात्। (3-2-25)

(v) अतोऽनन्तेन तथा हि लिङ्गम्। (3-2-26)

(vi) उभयव्यपदेशात्त्वहिकुण्डलवत्। (3-2-27)

(vii) प्रकाशाश्रयवद्वा तेजस्त्वात्। (3-2-28)

(viii) पूर्ववद्वा। (3-2-29)

(ix) प्रतिषेधाच्च। (3-2-30)

The first sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is प्रकृतैतावत्त्वं हि प्रतिषेधति ततो ब्रवीति च भूयः। (3-2-22) What has been mentioned up to this (the clause not this, not this) denies and (the śruti) says something more than that.

According to Śaṅkara (and Rāmānuja also), the passage under discussion would be द्वे वाव ब्रह्मणो रूपे। मूर्तं चैवामूर्तं च। मर्त्यं चामृतं च। स्थितं च यच्च। सच्च त्यच्च। तदेतन्मूर्तं यदन्यद्वायोश्चान्तरिक्षाच्च।... अथामूर्तम्। वायुश्चान्तरिक्षं च। एतदमृतम्।... अथात आदेशो नेति नेति। न ह्येतस्मादिति नेत्यन्यत्परमस्ति। (B.U. 2-3-1 to 6) (we have quoted some fragments from the long quotation by Śaṅkara). Verily there are two forms of Brahman : formed and formless, the mortal and the immortal, the unmoving and the moving, the actual and the true. This is the formed Brahman, whatever is different from the air and the atmosphere...

How the formless is the breath and the space. This is immortal.... Now this is the teaching 'not this, not this 'There is nothing from this, there is no other thing higher.

According to Śaṅkara, Brahman alone is the reality. We experience that the world and its reality to perception is not denied, only its transcendental reality is not accepted.

According to Rāmānuja, Brahman's nature cannot be confined to the attributes stated. Brahman is not just this much, it is much more.

P.M. Modi has a different v.v. According to him, the sūtra seems to refer to the śruti passage नाम्नो वाव भूयोऽ स्तीति तन्मे भगवन्ब्रवीत्विति। and so on in the C.U.

प्रकृतैतावत्त्वं हि प्रतिषेधति seems to refer to such sentences as अस्ति भगवो नाम्नो भूय इति नाम्नो वाव भूयोऽस्तीति in each of the sections of the C.U. 8-1 to 15. We may quote one of the passages नामैवैतत्। नामोपास्स्वेति। स यो नाम ब्रह्मेत्युपासते। यावन्नाम्नो गतं तत्रास्य यथा कामचारो भवति यो नाम ब्रह्मेत्युपास्ते। अस्ति भगवो नाम्नो भूय इति। नाम्नो वाच भूयोऽस्तीति। तन्मे भगवान्ब्रवीत्विति।

All this is mere name. Meditate on the name. He who meditates on name as Brahman becomes independent so far as name goes, he who meditates name as Brahman. 'Is there Venerable sir, anything greater tnan the name?' 'There is something greater than the name.' 'Tell that to me, venerable Sir.' P.M. Modi further elucidates द्रप्रकृतैतावत्त्वम् means ब्रह्मण: प्रकृतैतावत्त्वम्. The fact that Brahman is (only) so much (एतावत्) as is the topic in consideration (प्रकृत) and nothing more. In each of these sections Sanatkumāra denies that Brahman is only नाम, only वाक् etc. in so far as his reply to नारदल्ऽs question, regarding there

being any form of Brahman 'more' than the topic in discussion, is in the affirmative.'[1]

Here P.M. Modi seems to be on firmer grounds, as the phrasing in the sūtra (... प्रतिषेधति ततो ब्रवीति च भूयः। seems to favour his v.v. rather than that of Śaṅkara.

The second sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is तदव्यक्तमाह हि। (3-2-23) That (Brahman) is unmanifest, for thus scripture says. According to Śaṅkara, Brahman is not apprehended because it is unmanifest. Śaṅkara cites the passage (M.U. 3-1-8) He is not apprehended by the eye, nor by speech, nor by the other senses, not by penance, or good works.

According to P.M. Modi, the v.v. of the sūtra would be the passages from the Kaṭha U.

महतः परमव्यक्तमव्यक्तात्पुरुषः परः।
पुरुषान्न परं किंचित्सा काष्ठा सा परा गतिः।। (Kaṭha U. 3-2)
अशब्दमस्पर्शमरूपमव्ययं तथाऽरसं नित्यमगन्धवच्च यत्।
अनाद्यनन्तं महतः परं ध्रुवं निचाय्य तन्मृत्युमुखात्प्रमुच्यते।। (Kaṭha U. 3-15)

Beyond the great self is the Unmanifest, beyond the Unmanifest is the spirit, beyone the spirit there is nothing. That is the end (of the journey), that is the final goal.

The self without sound, without touch, and without form, undecaying is likewise, without taste, external, without smell, without beginning, without end, beyond the great, abiding, by discerning that, one is freed from the face of death.

Now, about the v.v. suggested by P.M. Modi, it may be stated that, it would be better if we leave out the Kaṭha U. 3-2 passage from consideration, as it is redolent with the Sāṁkhya terminology, and does not deal with unmanifest nature of the Brahman in absolute terms but, rather it speaks in relative terms. The same may be stated about the second passage quoted by P.M. Modi.

In this respect Śaṅkara's v.v. seems to be better, as it focusses on the unmanifest, non-apprehensible nature of Brahman without diverting or diluting our attention.

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, pp. 34-35

The next sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is अपि च संराधने प्रत्यक्षानुमाभ्याम्। (3-2-24) And Brahman is apprehended in perfect meditation also, according to perception (śruti) and inference (smṛti) (Only Śaṅkara has 'ca' after 'api' in the sūtra).

Brahman though not apprehended by the senses is realised in the state of meditation. Śaṅkara cites the śruti पराञ्चिखानि व्यतृणत् स्वयंभूस्तस्मात्पराङ्पश्यति नान्तरात्मन्।

कश्चिद्धीरः प्रत्यगात्मानमैक्षदावृत्तचक्षुरमृतत्वमिच्छन्। (Kaṭha U. 4-1).

The self existent pierced the openings of the senses so that they turn outward, therefore man works without, not within himself. Some wise man however, with his eyes closed and wishing for immortality saw the self within.

Śaṅkara cites the Smṛti

तं विनिद्रा जितश्वासाः संतुष्टाः संयतेन्द्रियाः।

ज्योतिः पश्यन्ति युञ्जानास्तस्मै योगात्मने नमः ।। (MBH. 12-1642)

He who is seen as light, by the yogins meditating on Him, sleepless, with suspended breath, with contented minds, with subdued senses, reverence be to him!

P.M. Modi admits that the sūtrakāra may be referring to śruti like Kaṭha U. which is quoted by Śaṅkara.'[1]

The fourth sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is

प्रकाशादिवच्चावैशेष्यं प्रकाशश्च कर्मण्यभ्यासात्। (3-2-25) And in the case of physical light, and the like, there is the non-distinction (of the two selves), the light (i.e. the intelligent self) (being divided) by its activity, according to the repeated declarations of scripture. According to Śaṅkara, if the object of meditation i.e. Brahman and the individual meditator, are different, that is on account of the adjuncts of the activity. In reality the two are one, as the texts declare तत्त्वमसि, अहं ब्रह्मास्मि।

P.M. Modi explains the sūtra in a different manner. प्रकाश can be gazed at through repeated practice, in the act of seeing it. Thus when by long practice one is able to gaze at the sun or sunlight, it is visualized to be also unmanifest or without any distinction in itself. Similarly Brahman is realized in propitiation. आदि in प्रकाशादि seems to refer to such things in which there is no

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, p. 39

distinction (अवैशेष्य). Such things are perhaps नीहार, धूम, अर्क etc. Perhaps the following verse from the S.U. may be useful here.[1]

नीहारधूमार्कानलानिलानां खद्योतविद्युत्स्फटिकशशिनाम्।
एतानि रूपाणि पुरः सराणि ब्रह्मण्यभिव्यक्तकराणि योगे।। (S.U. 2-11)

Fog, smoke, sun, wind, fireflies, lightning, crystal, moon, these are the preliminary forms which produce the manifestation of Brahman in Yoga.

P.M. Modi's v.v. is quite plausible. As he points out, this sūtra is no place to discuss the identity between the meditator and the meditated object i.e. Brahman.

The next sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is अतोऽनन्तेन तथा हि लिङ्गम्। (3-2-26) Therefore the individual soul enters into unity with the infinite (i.e. the Highest Self), for thus (is the scriptural) indication.

The individual soul is able to attain unity with the Highest Self; because the ignorance which is destroyed by knowledge is unreal. Śaṅkara cites from the M.U. स यो ह वै तत्परमं ब्रह्म वेद ब्रह्मैव भवति। (M.U. 3-2-9) He who knows that Highest Brahman becomes even Brahman.

According to P.M. Modi, this is a sūtra of pūrvapakṣa as there is a तु in the following sūtra. According to him śruti referred to is

अव्यक्तात्तु परः पुरुषो व्यापकोऽलिङ्ग एव च।
यज्ज्ञात्वा मुच्यते जन्तुरमृतत्वं च गच्छति।। (Kaṭha U. 6-8)

Beyond the Unmanifest is the person, all pervading and without any mark whatever. By knowing whom, a man is liberated and goes to life external.

P.M. Modi explains his stand on this sūtra in this way, 'So the opponent in sūtra 26 seems to argue that from the Unmanifest (अतः) one reaches or unites with the अनन्त or व्यापक पुरुष according to the śruti. Sūtra 26 uses अनन्त as a name and the word व्यपदेश in the next sūtra (27) also shows that by अनन्त some name (पुरुष who is व्यापक) is meant in sūtra 26. As will be clear from our interpretation of the sūtras 27-30, the pūrvapakṣa view of this sūtra seems to have a threefold implication (i) that from अव्यक्त there is a further progress to (ii) that पुरुष has a form (a fact

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, pp. 41-42

admitted by the sūtrakāra) and therefore he is अव्यक्त and (iii) that अव्यक्त ब्रह्मन् is not अनन्त or व्यापक.[1]

Now this sounds a bit farfetched.

Moreover, it is not correct to say that the occurrence of the particle तु does not necessarily mean a refutation of a pūrvapakṣa earlier raised. There cannot be any hard and fast rule.

P.M. Modi writes about Śaṅkara's interpretation. अतः in sūtra 26, does not refer to अव्यक्त according to Śaṅkara; who interprets it as स्वाभाविकत्वादभेदस्य अविद्याकृतत्वाच्च भेदस्य. भेद and अभेद are not at all mentioned in the preceeding sūtras and therefore, अतः cannot refer to them.[2]

Now this comes down to this, Supposing Śaṅkara had not written the line स्वाभाविकत्वादभेदस्य and simply explained अतः जीवप्रज्ञयोरभेदत्वात्, जीवः परेणानन्तेन प्राज्ञेनात्मनैकतां गच्छति, then perhaps this explanation would not have been so objectionable to P.M. Modi because the phrasing of the sūtra does not preclude this either. Further P.M. Modi's hierarchy of अव्यक्त, पुरुष and अव्यक्त ब्रह्मन् we are aftraid, has not become universally acceptable.[3]

The next sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is उभयव्यपदेशात्त्वहिकुण्डलवत्। (3-2-27) But on account of the twofold teaching (the relation of the Highest self to the individual soul is to be viewed) as that between a serpent and its coils.

According to Śaṅkara, this is a primafacie view.

There are texts which suggest a difference between the individual soul and the Highest Brahman. ततस्तु तं पश्यति निष्कलं ध्यायमानः। (M.U. 3-1-8) Then he sees him meditating on Him as without parts. परात्परं पुरुषमुपैति दिव्यम्। (M.U. 3-2-8) He goes to the divine Person who is greater than the great. These texts indicate the difference between the individual soul and the Highest soul. This means that prior to liberation, the difference between the two is real though it is one of identity after liberation. The relation is one of difference and non-difference as that between a serpent and its coils. As a serpent it is one, but if we look at the coils, hood etc., there is a difference. Similarly there is both

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, pp. 41-42
2. Ibid p. 42
3. See his discuşsion on Ibid, pp. 55 to 58

difference and non-difference between the individual soul and the Highest-Self.

Again P.M. Modi raises the question of 15. According to P.M. Modi, तु shows that this is a सिद्धान्तसूत्र and the proceeding sūtra a pūrvapakṣa. Now it may be contended, as on the earlier occasion in this adhikaraṇa, that there cannot be any strict rule, about the particle तु. Much would depend upon the context. तु. Much would depend upon the context. तु may indicate an imagined pūrvapakṣa (not necessarily mentioned in the earlier sūtra) or a sort of a lurking doubt which is often sought to be voiced by sūtrakāra with the help of तु. So, it appears perfectly legitimate for Śaṅkara to say तस्मिन्नेव संराध्यसंराधकभावे मन्वन्तरमुपन्यस्यति स्वमतविशुद्धये। In order to justify his own view as to the relations of the worshipping individual soul and the worshipped higher self, the sūtrakāra mentions a different point of view of the same matter.

The next sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is प्रकाशाशयवद्वा तेजस्त्वात्। (3-2-28) Or else like that of light to its substratum, both being fire. This sūtra contains an illustration and does not have a v.v. P.M. Modi continues his favourite thesis of पुरुष and अव्यक्त, which we feel that, has not been accepted universally in the Vedāntic lore, ancient as well as modern.

The next sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is पूर्ववद्वा। (3-2-29) Or (the relations of the two is to be conceived) in the manner stated previously.

The last sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is प्रतिषेधाच्च। (3-2-30) And on account of the denial, Śaṅkara states that passages like नान्यतोऽस्ति द्रष्टा (B.U. 3-7-23) There is no other witness but he. This shows that there is no other reality than Brahman.

P.M. Modi explains the sūtra in this way. 'In sūtra (अतोऽनन्तेन तथा हि लिङ्गम्)। the opponent tried to show that from the Unmanifest a liberated soul would unite with the Infinite i.e. with the पुरुष on the strength of Kaṭha U. 6-6-. In sūtra 27, the sūtrakāra says that Brahman is called both अव्यक्त and पुरुष and therefore, it is like अहि and कुण्डल so that अव्यक्त and पुरुष are not different and therefore a meditator does not go to and unite with व्यापक पुरुष from the अव्यक्त. In sūtra 28, he gave another example about the unity of Brahman, whatever, it be called अव्यक्त or पुरुष. In 29, he

showed his preference for the example in sūtra 27. In sūtra 30, the sūtrakāra gives his reason preferring analogy in sūtra 27 to that in sūtra 28. प्रतिषेध in sūtra 30 seems to be a reference to न तथात्वम् (3-2-19) which denies the तेजस्त्व (i.e. तेज:स्वभावत्व) of Brahman. Thus the analogy based upon तेजस्त्व of Brahman is not the view favoured by the sūtrakara.[1] This somewhat longwinded explanation only goes to prove that how hazardous is the task of interpretation of the Brahmasūtras. This explanation by P.M. Modi sounds unconvincing. First of all, why should the sūtrakāra give an analogy which in the end is not to be favoured by him? Why whould he waste two sūtras on that analogy which, ultimately, he is going to discard?

Parādhikaraṇam (3-2-31 to 37)

The adhikaraṇa has seven sūtras (3-2-31 to 37)

(i) परमत: सेतून्मानसंबन्धभेदव्यपदेशेभ्य:। (3-2-31)

(ii) सामान्यात्तु। (3-2-32)

(iii) बुद्ध्यर्थ: पादवत्। (3-2-33)

(iv) स्थानविशेषात्प्रकाशादिवत्। (3-2-34)

(v) उपपत्तेश्च। (3-2-35)

(vi) तथान्यप्रतिषेधात्। (3-2-36)

(vii) अनेन सर्वगतत्वमायामशब्दादिभ्य:।। (3-2-37)

The first sūtra is परमत: सेतून्मानसंबन्धभेदव्यपदेशेभ्य: (3-2-31) Beyond this (Brahman there is something further) on account of the designations of bridge, measure, connection and separation. This sūtra states a primafacie view. An objection based upon certain texts mentioning bridge is raised अथ य आत्मा स सेतुर्विधृति:। (C.U. 8-4-1) Now the Self is the bridge, the boundary for keeping these worlds apart. This indicates, that, pūrvapakṣa would argue, there is something else than Brahman. This much regarding the word सेतु in the sūtra.

Now उन्मान. Moreover there is a reference to size.

तदेतद्ब्रह्म चतुष्पादष्टाशफं षोडशकलमिति। This Brahman has four feet, eight hoofs, sixteen parts. The self has size and so, the opponent would say, it is limited.

Again there is a reference to the connection,

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, pp. 44-45

तदा संपन्नो भवति। (C.U. 6-8-1) प्राज्ञेनात्मना संपरिष्वक्तः। (B.U. 4-3-21)

Then he is united with the true. The embodied self is embraced in the Highest Self. This shows Brahman's connection.

And there is a designation of difference. अथ य एषोऽन्तरादित्ये हिरण्मयः पुरुषो दृश्यते। (C.U. 1-6-6) Now that golden person who is seen with the sun. This indicates that there is a difference and there exists something different from Brahman.

P.M. Modi comes out with a different explanation with a different v.v. According to him, परः does not seem to mean only अन्यः but it means 'another higher'. The pūrvapakṣa means that the Supreme Being is higher than the अव्यक्त and Kaṭha U. is the tex. which rerers to अव्यक्त i.e. यः सेतुरीजानानामक्षरं ब्रह्म यत्परम्।

अभयं तितीर्षतां पारं नाचिकेतं शकेमहि।। (Kaṭha U. 1-3-2)

That bridge for those who sacrifice and which is the highest imperishable Brahman for those who wish to cross over to the farther fearless shore, that Nāciketa fire that we master.

The pūrvapakṣa argues that source अव्यक्त is declared to be a सेतु the Supreme Principle must be beyond the अव्यक्त i.e. the पुरुष is beyond अव्यक्त. This much for the setuvyapadeśaḥ.

For unmānavyapadeśaḥ P.M. Modi quotes from the Kaṭha U.

अङ्गुष्ठमात्रः पुरुषो मध्ये आत्मनि तिष्ठति। ईशानो भूतभव्यस्य न ततो विजुगुप्सते एतद्वै तत्। (Kaṭha U. 4-12)

The person of the size of a thumb resides in the middle of the body. After knowing him who is the Lord of the past and the future, one does not shrink. This verily is that.

For sambandhavyapadeśah, according to P.M. Modi, a likely śruti is

स्वप्नान्तं जागरितान्तं चौभौ येनानुपश्यति।

महान्तं विभुमात्मानं मत्वा धीरो न शोचति।। (Kaṭha 4-14)

That by which one perceives both dream states and waking states, having known the great, omnipresent Self, the wise man does not grieve. Pūrvapakṣa seems to argue that in this śruti, the अव्यक्त is declared to be that which the individual soul sees or experiences, the states of dream and that of waking. Thus the soul is declared to be connected with the अव्यक्त.

Then the bhedavyapadeśaḥ. The opponent points out that the śruti mentions the अव्यक्त and the higher one to be different. The

text is महत: परम व्यक्तमव्यक्तात्पुरुष: पर:। पुरुषान्न परं किञ्चित्सा काष्ठा सा परा गति: ।। (Kaṭha U. 3-11)

Beyond the great self is the Unmanifest, beyond the Unmanifest is the spirit. Beyond the spirit there is nothing. That is the end (of the journey), that is the final goal.

According to P.M. Modi, the अव्यक्त text of the Kaṭha U. (Kaṭha U. 3-11) is to be considered as a v.v. of this pūrvapakṣa sūtra (3-2-31)[1]

Now we submit the following remarks. First of all,

Kaṭha U. text as noted earlier, is rife with the Sāṁkhya terminology and these passages have already been dealt with in the sūtras of 1-4. The theory which P.M. Modi wants to expound has not found universal acceptance and at least, alien to the Vedāntic lore. From this point of view also, this passage is not acceptable as a v.v. of this sūtra. So for seturvyapadeśa Śaṅkara's v.v. seems to be better suited to the context. For unmānvyapadeśa, instead of P.M. Modi's v.v. अङ्गुष्ठमात्रपुरुषो... (Kaṭha 4-12) which forms the v.v. of the sūtra 1-2-24, Śaṅkara's taking up a passage describing Brahman as having four feet, seems to be better. As to the sambandhavyapadeśa and bhedavyapadeśa these terms are connotative of almost all-embracing import, any passage having some connection with sambandha and bheda one can take it or leave it. For that matter, Śaṅkara's v.v.s are not worse either. But in any case, the Kaṭha U. texts do not stand a chance here in this sūtra. Further, if we accept that sūtrakāra's objective of composing the Brahmasūtra is to reconcile and interpret as many Upaniṣadic passages as possible, then, also, it is desirable to avoid the repetition of the passages unless they are having a universal currency and application in the Vedāntic Lore.

The second sūtra is सामान्यात्तु (3-2-32) But (Brahman is called a bridge) on account of similarity. Brahman is called a bridge, not because there is something beyond it but, because, like a bridge which keeps back water, and marks the boundary of adjacent fields. Brahman maintains the world and its boundaries.

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, p. 57

P.M. Modi, consistent with his stand on अव्यक्त explains the sūtra in that fashion.[1]

The third sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is बुद्ध्यर्थः पादवत्। (3-2-33) (The statement that Brahman has size is) for the sake of comprehension, just like feet. It is self explanatory.

The fourth sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is स्थानविशेषात्प्रकाशादिवत्। (3-2-34) (The statements in regard to connection and difference) are due to difference of place, as in the case of light etc. It is in continuation of the arguments made by pūrvapakṣa in the sūtra 3-2-31.

The fifth sūtra is उपपत्तेश्च। (3-2-35) And from reasoning. There is nothing to say about from the v.v. point of view.

The sixth sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is (तथान्यप्रतिषेधात्। (3-2-36) similarly on account of the denial of other (entities) Śaṅkara quotes several śrutis which do not admit the existence of anything other than Brahman. ब्रह्मैवेदं सर्वम्। (M.U. 2-2-11) आत्मैवेदं सर्वम्। (C.U. 7-25-2), यस्मात्परं नापरमस्ति किंचित्। (S.U. 3-9) 'Brahman alone is all this.' 'The self is all this.' He to whom there is nothing superior from whom there is nothing different.'

P.M. Modi's objection that Śaṅkara however quotes several śrutis which do not expressly deny the existence of a second principle.'[2] appears to be flimsy.

The last sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is अनेन सर्वगतत्वमायामशब्दादिभ्यः। (3-2-37) By this, the all-pervadingness (of Brahman is established) in accordance with the statements about (Brahman's) extent.

The word अनेन in the sūtra definitely, beyond any doubt, connects the sūtra to what preceeded, and so, it is not logical to form a separate adhikaraṇa as P.M. Modi has done.[3] Further, the word आयाम does suggest the śrutis quoted by Śaṅkara. यावान्वा अयमाकाशस्तावानेषोऽन्तर्हृदय आकाशः। (C.U. 8-1-3) ज्यायान्दिवः। (C.U. 3-14-3) 'The ātman, ākāśa within the heart is as large as the ākāśa

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, p. 58
2. Ibid p. 66
3. Ibid p. 73

outside.' 'He is greater than the heaven,' These śrutis serve better or are perfect as v.v.s in spite of the protestations by P.M. Modi.[1]

Phalādhikaraṇam (3-2-38 to 41)

The last adhikaraṇa of the second pāda of the third adhyāya has the following sūtras:

(i) फलमत उपपत्तेः। (3-2-38)

(ii) श्रुतत्वाच्च। (3-2-39)

(iii) धर्मं जैमिनिरत एव। (3-2-40)

(iv) पूर्वं तु बादरायणो हेतुव्ययपदेशात्। (3-2-41)

The first sūtra is फलमत उपपत्तेः। (3-2-38) From him the fruit, for that is reasonable. The question is discussed whether the fruits of action spring from actions themselves or from the God.

Here it may be noted that P.M. Modi take the word फल meaning मोक्ष.

The second sūtra is (श्रुतत्वाच्च। (3-2-39) And because of the scriputre so teaches. Śaṅkara quotes from the B.U. स वा एष महानज आत्मान्नादो वसुदानः। (B.U. 4-4-24)

This indeed is the great unborn self, the giver of food, the giver of wealth.

P.M. Modi takes the fruit meaning मोक्षं and hence quotes the following texts.

नायमात्मा प्रवचनेन लभ्यो न मेधया न बहुना श्रुतेन।

यमेषैष वृणुते तेन लभ्यस्तस्यैष आत्मा विवृणुते तनुं स्वाम्।। (M.U. 3-2-3, 4)

नयमात्मा बलहीनेन लभ्यो न च प्रमादात्तपसो वाप्यलिङ्गात्।

एतैदुपायैर्यतते यस्तु विद्वांस्तस्यैष आत्मा विशते ब्रह्मधाम।।

The self cannot be attained by instruction, nor by intellectual power nor even through much hearing. He is to be attained by the one whom the self chooses. To such a one, the self reveals his own nature.

This self cannot be obtained by one without strength nor through heedlessness nor through austerity, without an aim. But he who strives by these means if he is a knower, this self of his enters the abode of Brahman.

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, p. 73

As Jaimini is quoted in the next sūtra, it is more plausible to take the word फल in the sense of the fruits of actions.

The third sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is धर्मं जैमिनिरत एव। (3-2-40) Jaimini says that the fruit is Dharma (religious merit) because of this very reason. This sūtra presents a purvamīmāṁsā view, that the result springs from the deed only.

P.M. Modi holds that अत एव seems to be a reference to a śruti in wnich the religious merit (धर्म) mentioned as to be given by the Supreme Being. He quotes the śruti एष ह्येव साधु कर्म कारयति तं यमेभ्यो लोकेभ्यो उन्निनीषते। एष उ एवासाधु कर्म कारयति तं यमधोनिनीषते। (Kau.U. 3-8)

This one, indeed also causes him whom he wishes to lead up from these worlds to perform good actions This one, indeed, also causes him whom he wishes to lead downward to perform bad actions.

In this śruti Brahman is said to give the fruit in the form of साधुकर्म 'religious merit'. Jaimini, according to this sūtra held that it was the fruit in the form of religious merit which would be given by Brahman.

It seems probable that as Jaimini is quoted in the sūtra, the फल in the previous sūtra means the fruits of actions and not मोक्ष as made out by P.M. Modi. This stands further corroborated by the following sūtra in which the पूर्व, perhaps in contrast to the word अपूर्वम् (though the word not actually used in the previous sūtra) is used as an intended paranomasia.

The last sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is पूर्वं तु बादरायणो हेतुव्यपदेशात्। (3-2-41)

Bādarāyaṇa, however, thinks the former (i.e. the Lord) (to be the cause of the fruits of actions), since he is designated as the cause of the actions.

According to Bādarāyaṇa, Brahman is the dispenser of rewards. Śaṅkara quotes the passage from the Kau.U. (3-8) referred to by P.M. Modi in the sūtra 3-2-40.

Thus to this pāda, it must have been noticed that, P.M. Modi has given much thougnt and any student working on the Brahmasūtra text proper, has to take into account the work done by P.M. Modi, with considerable critical accumen. However, his findings are likely to suffer from two limitations. First, he has

kept in view only a certain portion of the Brahma sūtra (3-2-11 to 4-4) and not the whole of it. Secondly he has his favourite theory regarding अव्यक्त, पुरुष, अक्षर and ब्रह्म. With the preconceived notions of this theory he goes about his work applying his critical acumen, and hence, he also, sometimes, happens to perform like an ancient commentator with his own philosophical persuasion. So, it would have been observed that we have treated him also, like that, along with ancient commentators, according to our lights.

CHAPTER - 8

VIṢAYAVĀKYAS OF THE PĀDA 3 AND 4 OF THE THIRD ADHYĀYA

3-3 (1 to 66)

This third pāda is called Upāsanā pāda. George Thibaut introduces the pāda in this way: 'With the third pāda of the third adhyāya, a new section of the work begins whose task it is to describe how the individual soul is enabled by meditation on Brahman to obtain final release.'[1] V.S. Ghate avers, 'The first and second pādas though belonging to the Sādhanādhyāya, or the chapter dealing with the means of attaining mokṣa really dealt with the nature and attributes of the Brahman and the nature of transmigrations. It is with the third pāda that the consideration of meditations or cognitions leading to the attainment of the Brahman really begins.'[2] Radhakrishnan explains in this manner, 'This part describes now the individual can by meditation on Brahman obtain final release. In different branches of Vedic learning the same meditations are described with slight or major modifications. But there is unity on the nature of Brahman and the relation to it of the human soul, in the present part attempts are made to remove the contradictions in the sacred texts and achieve reconciliation of the different Vedānta texts on this matter.'[3]

The pāda begins with the **Sarvavedāntapratyayādhikaraṇam** (3-3-1 to 4)

The adhikaraṇa has the following sūtras:

(i) सर्ववेदान्तप्रत्ययं चोदनाद्यविशेषात्। (3-3-1)

(ii) भेदान्नेति चेन्नैकस्यामपि। (3-3-2)

(iii) स्वाध्यायस्य तथात्वेन हि समाचारेऽधिकाराच्च सववच्च तन्नियमः। (3-3)

(iv) दर्शयति च। (3-3-4)

---

1. Thibaut George, Vedānta Sūtras, Part-I, p. xvi
2. Ghate V.S., The Vedānta, p. 123
3. S. Radhakrishnan, The Brahmasūtra, p. 468

As noted above in the introduction to this chapter, the pāda deals with the Upāsanā, and this adhikaraṇa is also a sort of introduction to the whole of the pāda and hence we shall go through it, even though it has little bearing on the v.v. as such.

The first sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is सर्ववेदान्तप्रत्ययं चोदनाद्यविशेषात्। (3-3-1) The forms of meditation described in all the Vedānta texts are not different on account of the non-difference of injunctions and so on.

The meditation on prāṇa is described in one way in B.U. यो ह वै ज्येष्ठं च श्रेष्ठं च वेद। (B.U. 6-1-1) and in a different way in C.U. 5-1-1. But they are not different meditations because of the similarity as regards injunction, connection, name and form. There is non-difference even as regards the fruit or the result of meditation. This is true not only of prāṇavidyā but also Vaiśvānara vidyā, Śāṇḍilyavidyā etc.

The second sūtra is भेदान्नेति चेन्नैकस्यामपि। (3-3-2)

If it be said (that the meditations) are not one, on account of difference (in minor points) (we reply) not so, since even in one and the same vidyā there might be minor differences.

The third sūtra is स्वाध्यायस्य तथात्वेन समाचारेऽधिकाराच्च सववच्च तन्नियम:। (3-3-3) The rite of carrying fire on the head is connected) with the study of the Veda because (it is described) as such in the samācāra: this also follows from its being a qualification for the students of the Atharvaveda, as is the case with seven oblations. The sūtra holds that rite of carrying fire on the head is not an essential attribute of the vidyā, but of the study of one Veda of the Ātharvaṇikas.

According to P.M. Modi, there is no reference to the शिरोव्रत of the आथर्वणिक in the sūtra at all.

The fourth sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is (3-3-4). Scripture also declares thus. This has a दर्शयति च। reference to such texts as सर्वे वेदा यत्पदमामनन्ति। (Kaṭha U. 2-14) The śruti shows that only one Brahman is known from all the Vedāntas.

Upasaṁhārādhikaraṇam (3-3-5) The second adhikaraṇa of the pāda, comprises only one sūtra. The sūtra is उपसंहारोऽर्थाभेदाद्विधिशेषवत्समाने च। (3-3-5) In the case of (a meditation) common (to several śākhās or branches), a

combination (of particulars mentioned in each is to be made) since, there is no difference of essential matter even as in the case of what is subsidiary to the main sacrifice.

The object of meditation is one only: comprehending all the attributes mentioned in various texts.

According to P.M. Modi, as Brahman, is to be shown to be सर्ववेदान्तप्रत्यय the collection (उपसंहार) is to be made from all the Vedāntas, not merely from two or more Vedāntas.[1] Further the collection is not to be made mutually by two or more branches dealing with the same vidyā as Śaṅkara and other commentators say, but it is to be made by the followers of all the branches of all the Vedas as is implied in सर्ववेदान्तप्रत्यय.

Anyathātvādhikaraṇam (3-3-6 to 8)

The adhikaraṇa has the following three sūtras:

(i) अन्यथात्वं शब्दादिति चेन्नाविशेषात्। (1-3-6)

(ii) न वा प्रकरणभेदात्परोवरीयस्त्वादिवत्। (3-3-7)

(iii) संज्ञातश्चेतदुक्तमस्ति तु तदपि। (3-3-8)

The first sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is अन्यथात्वं शब्दादिति चेन्नाविशेषात्। (3-3-6) If it be said that (the udgītha vidyā of the B.U. and that of the C.U.) are separate on account of difference of texts, we say, it is not so, because there is no difference as regards essentials.

Śaṅkara takes this to be a pūrvapakṣa According to the opponent, the vidyās are one, because in spite of the differences of texts, there is unity in essentials.

According to P.M. Modi, in the sūtra itself there is no reference to the प्राणविद्या or उद्गीथविद्या[2]

The next sūtra is न वा प्रकरणभेदात्परोवरीयस्त्वादिवत्। (3-3-7) But not there is unity of Vidyās owing to the difference of subject matter even as (the meditation on the udgītha), the highest and the greatest is different.

The two vidyās are different on account of differences in subject matter. In the C.U. 1-1-1 ओमित्येतदक्षरमुद्गीथमुपासीत्। Let a

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, pp. 91-92
2. Ibid p. 93

man meditate on the syllable Aum as the Udgītha. Here the introductory sentence represents as the object of meditation the syllable Aum which is a part of the Udgītha. In the B.U. 1-3-2 the whole Udgītha hymn is meditated on as prāṇa. So the two vidyās cannot be described as one. Moreover, in the C.U. 1-9-2 Udgītha is described as स एष परोवरीयानुद्गीथ: स एषोऽनन्त: । (C.U. 1-9-2) He is indeed the Udgītha, greater than the great, he is without end. This passage from the C.U. should prove to be one of the v.v.s of the sūtra, as the world परोवरीयस् is quoted in the sūtra itself.

As usual P.M. Modi does not agree with Śaṅkara,[1] but, the word परोवरीय: should remove any doubt regarding the Udgīthavidyā being the topic of discussion.

The third sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is संज्ञातश्चेत्तदुक्तमस्ति तु तदपि। (3-3-8) If it be said that they are one on account of name being the same, it has already been said that even that identity of name in different vidyās exists.

The identity of name does not mean unity of the vidyās.

Vyāptyadhikaraṇam (3-3-9)

The adhikaraṇa has only one sūtra व्याप्तेश्च समञ्जसम्। (3-3-9) And because (Aum) extends (to all the Vedas) to specialise it (by the term udgītha) is appropriate.

ओमित्येतदक्षरमुद्गीथमुपासीत। (C.U. 1-1-1) Let a man meditate on the syllable Aum as the Udgītha, The two words Aum and Udgītha are placed in co-ordination.

P.M. Modi[2] and B.N.K. Sharma[3] do not agree with Śaṅkara, but the discussion by them do not have bearing on the v.v. So we do not go into it.

Sarvabhedādhikaraṇam (3-3-10)

This is also a one-sūtra adhikaraṇa. The sūtra is सर्वभेदादन्यत्रेमे। (3-3-10) Since (the vidyās) are non-different everywhere, these (qualities which are found in some are to be inserted) in the other places (also).

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I p. 95
2. Ibid pp. 97-98
3. B.N.K. Sharma, The Brahmsūtras and their Principal commentaties, Vol. III, p. 240

In C.U. 5-1-1, B.U. 6-1 prāṇa is mentioned as the eldest, the best and the richest and so on. In the Kau.U. Prāṇa is described as the best only, and other attributes are not mentioned. The question is whether the other attributes are to be inserted here also. The answer is that as the meditations relate to one entity prāṇa, the qualities mentioned in one context are likely to strike to our minds in the other context, and so, the qualities are to be included.

According to P.M. Modi, the word इमे in the sūtra is feminine dual referring to the two संज्ञा mentioned in the sūtra 3-3-8 and thereby to the अरूपवत् and रूपवत् aspects of Brahman. To him, the word सर्वभेदात् does not contain even the slightest reference to which Śaṅkara refers.[1]

Ānandādyadhikaraṇam (3-3-11 to 13)

The adhikaraṇa has three sūtras viz.

(i) आनन्दादय: प्रधानस्य। (3-3-11)

(ii) प्रियशिरस्त्वाद्यप्राप्तिरुपचयापचयौ हि भेदे। (3-3-12) (iii) इतरे त्वर्थसामान्यात्। (3-3-13)

The first sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is आनन्दादय: प्रधानस्य। (3-3-11) Bliss and other qualities as belonging to the subject of the qualities (have to be attributed to Brahman everywhere).

The question is whether in each place, where Brahman is mentioned, we have to understand only the qualities mentioned there or all the qualities. The answer is since Brahman to which qualities belong is one and without any difference, the qualities also should be the same.

Rāmānuja and Vallabha interpret the sūtra on the same line.

According to P.M. Modi, 'आनन्दादय: must refer to a list of attributes collected from various Vedāntas, in which आनन्द is the first (आदि). Śaṅkara and other ācāryas mention general attributes but give no such list as is required by the nature of बहुव्रीहि compound.[2] In our opinion, आनन्द in this sūtra is a reference to जन्माद्यस्य यत:। (B.S. 1-1-2) which itself refers to आनन्दात् ह्येव.. (T.U. 3-6) आदि in आनन्दादि refers to आनन्दमय (B.S. 1-1-12), अन्तरादित्य (B.S. 1-1-20), आकाश (B.S. 1-1-22), प्राण (B.S. 1-1-23), ज्योति: (B.S.

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I pp. 100-101
2. Ibid pp. 103-105

1-1-24) and प्राण (B.S. 1-1-28). Thus आनन्दादय: seems to us to be a reference to all the attributes in the śrutis discussed in B.S. 1-1.

The second sūtra is प्रियशिरस्त्वाद्यप्राप्तिरूपचयापचयौ हि भेदे। (3-5-12) (Such qualities as) joy being its head and so on have no force for other passages), for increase and decrease (are possible only) if there is difference.

Attributes like joy, satisfaction, great satisfaction, bliss, are qualities with lower and higher degrees. These degress are possible only where there is plurality and Brahman is devoid of plurality. They are attributed to Brahman merely as an aid for concentration. The sūtra has the T.U. passage तस्य प्रियं शिर:.. as the viṣayavākya.

P.M. Modi has interpretational difference of opinion with Śaṅkara, but, he does admit that the T.U. passage is the topic of discussion of the sūtra[1] (and adhikaraṇa also)

The third sūtra is इतरे त्वर्थसामान्यात्। (3-3-13) But other (attributes are valid for all passages related to Brahman) on account of the identity of the purport. Attributes like bliss, knowledge, all-pervadingness, which describe the nature of Brahman are to be combined since their purport is one and indivisible Brahman.

P.M. Modi has a different way of explaining the thing.

He writes, 'The sūtrakāra has mentioned आनन्दादय: in sūtra 11 and प्रियशिरस्त्वादय: in sūtra 12. Now by इतरे he must be referring to a third group of attributes. Again, as अप्राप्ति: occurs in sūtra 12, this third group seems to us to be a group of attributes which the sūtrakāra has rejected i.e. which he has not mentioned in B.S. 1-1-3. We mean that if we look to the contexts (sūtra 12) should be a group of rejected attributes.... It seems to us that इतरे refers to such attributes as are mentioned in

एतद्वै तदक्षरं गार्गि ब्राह्मणा अभिवदन्त्यस्थूलमनण्वह्रस्वमदीर्घलोहितमस्नेह-मच्छायमतमोऽवाय्वनाकाशमसङ्गमरसमगन्धमचक्षुष्कमश्रोत्रमवागमनोऽतेजस्कम-प्राणममुखममात्रमनन्तरबाह्यं न तदश्नाति किंचन न तदश्नाति कश्चन। (B.U. 3-8-8)

That O Gārgi, the knowers of Brahman declare the Imperishable. It is neither gross, nor subtle, neither short nor

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, pp. 105-106

long, neither red nor sticking neither shadow nor darkmess, neither air nor space unattached, without taste, without smell, without eyes, without ears, without voice, without mind, without radiance, without breath, without a mouth, without measure, having no within and without. It eats nothing and none eats it.'

'According to the sūtrakāra,' 'P.M. Modi continues, 'these attributes have the same aim, therefore they have not been admitted (अप्राप्ति) by him in his list of attributes of the प्रधान aspect of Brahman'[1] (B.S. 1-1)

Now this rejection of the śruti is something alien to the Brahmasūtrakāra who believes in bringing in together as many śrutis as possible and reconciling them as he so gloriously puts it तत्तु समन्वयात्। (1-1-4) Spirit of harmonisation is permeating the entire of, the Brahmasūtra, and hence, this rejection 'is to be rejected outright!'

Ādhyānādhikaraṇam (3-3-14 to 15) The adhikaraṇa has two sūtras viz.

(i) आध्यानाय प्रयोजनाभावात्। (3-3-14)

(ii) आत्मशब्दाच्च. (3-3-15)

The first sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is आध्यानाय प्रयोजनाभावात्। (3-3-14) it is for the purpose of meditation, since, there is no other objective.

According to Śaṅkara, this adhikaraṇa refers to the Kaṭha U. passage

इन्द्रियेभ्यः पराह्यर्था अर्थेभ्यश्च परं मनः।
मनसस्तु परा बुद्धि बुद्धेरात्मा महान्परः।। (Kaṭha 1-3-10)

Beyond the senses are the objects (of the senses) and beyond objects is the mind, beyond the mind is the great self.

Then further

महतः परमव्यक्तमव्यक्तात्पुरुषः परः।
पुरुषान्न परं किंचित्सा काष्ठा सा परा गतिः।। (1-3-11)

Beyond the great self is the unmanifest, beyond the Umnanifest is the spirit. Beyond the spirit there is nothing. That is the end (of the) journey, that is the final goal.

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I p. 107

The sūtra maintains that the aim of the passage is to show the spirit as higher than everything because it is aimed at meditation.

Rāmānuja takes the sūtras upto 17 as a part of the earlier adhikaraṇa i.e. ānandādyadhikaraṇam and so continues the consideration of the T.U. passage 2-5 which represents Brahman as having joy for its head and so on, and maintains that it is intended for the purpose of meditation.

P.M. Modi continues his interpretation of the word इतरे and rejects the śruti suggested by Śaṅkara, stating that, it has been discussed by the sūtrakāra in seven sūtras (B.S. 1-4-1 to 4).[1]

The advantage, the v.v. suggested by Śaṅkara has that, the word आत्मन् is found in the passage from the Kaṭha U. 1-3-10. आत्मशब्दाच्च। (3-3-15) And on account of the word self. The subject of the discussion is the Self.

According to Madhva, the sūtra has a reference to the śruti आत्मेत्येवोपासीत अत्र ह्येते सर्व एकं भवन्ति। (B.U. 1-4-7)

In this śruti, as B.N.K. Sharma explains, 'the particle 'eva' embodies the sanction for limiting the meditation to as few attributes as are within the competence of the lesser adhikārins.[2]

P.M. Modi continues the interpretation of the word इतरे and quotes a B.U. passage (B.U. 3-7-23) for the qualities to be rejected.[3]

Ātmagṛhītyadhikaraṇam (3-3-16, 17)

This adhikaraṇa has the two sūtras:

(i) आत्मगृहीतिरितरवदुत्तरात्। (3-3-16)

(ii) अन्वयादिति चेत्स्यादवधारणात्। (3-3-17)

The first sūtra is आत्मगृहीतिरितरवदुत्तरात् (3-3-16)

The Highest Self is meant (in the Aitareya U. 1-1) as in other texts (dealing with the creation on account of the subsequent qualification).

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, pp. 108-109
2. B.N.K. Sharma, The Brahmasūtras and their Principal commentaries, Vol. III, pp. 270-71
3. Modi P.M., A critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, pp. 109-110

The text referred to, according to Śaṅkara is आत्मा वा इदमेक एवाग्र आसीन्नान्यत्किंचन मिषत्स ईक्षत लोकान्नु सृजा इति। स इमाल्लोकानसृजताम्भो मरीचिर्मरमाप:। (Ai.U. 1-2) The self verily was all this, one only in the beginning. Nothing else, whatsoever, winked. He thought, let me now create the worlds. He created these worlds, the waters, the rays, the mortal and water. The question is whether the self refers to the supreme self or Hiraṇyagarbha. It refers to the Supreme Self as in other texts तस्माद्वा एतस्मादात्मन आकाश: संभूत:। (T.U. 2-1) From that Self, ether was produced.

For Rāmānuja, these two sūtras are a part of the ānandādyadhikaraṇam, and so, continues the discussion of the T.U. passage.

Madhva takes this, a one-sūtra-adhikaraṇa and refers to the śruti आत्मेत्येवोंपासीत। In the śruti, by the term ātman, all the other principal attributes of bliss, intelligence etc. are also taken into account because of what follows the vidhivākya in the form of an arthavāda just as in other cases like satyam, jñānam, anantam, several other attributes besides those mentioned are also conveyed.

P.M. Modi explicated, 'According to Śaṅkara, the sūtra discusses whether आत्मा in Ai.U. 1-1 means परमात्मा or something else like प्रजापति:। The reason given by Śaṅkara for raising this question seems to us to be very weak. Again आत्मा in Ai.U. 1-1 according to Śaṅkara, is meant to denote परमात्मा by the sūtrakāra and Śaṅkara shows this by interpreting आत्मा in आत्मागृहीति as परमात्मा.

If these were really the case, why should the sūtrakāra himself not have worded the sūtra as परमात्मागृहीति: instead of the expression आत्मगृहीति: which is vague. [1] Now this argument by P.M. Modi is not convincing as the avowed objective of the sūtrakāra is to elucidate the śruti passages. If the sūtrakāra were to employ the word परमात्मागृहीति:। instead of आत्मगृहीति: how the word आत्मन् in the A.U. is meant to connote the परमात्मन् would be clarified. If one does not agree with Śaṅkara's v.v. and his interpretation, it is a different matter.

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I p.113

The second sūtra is अन्वयादिति चेत्स्यादवधारणात्। (3-3-17) If it be said that on account of the context (the Highest Self is not meant) (we say) that it may be so because of the statement (that the self alone existed at the beginning.)

The Highest Self is meant and not Hiraṇyagarbha.

Śaṅkara presents one more interpretation or rather offers some other passages as v.v. कतम आत्मेति योऽयं विज्ञानमयः प्राणेषु हृद्यन्तर्ज्योतिः पुरुषः... स वा एष महानज आत्माऽजरोऽमरोऽमृतोऽभयो ब्रह्म। (B.U. 4-4-25)

Who is that Self? He who is within the heart, surrounded by the prāṇas, consisting of knowledge, the person of light... This great unborn self undecaying, undying, immortal, fearless is indeed Brahman. In the C.U. सदेव सोम्येदमग्रआसीदेकमेवाद्वितीयम्। C.U. or स आत्मा तत्त्वमसि। (C.U. 6-8-7) Being only this was in the beginning, one without a second... That is the Self, thou art That.

Rāmānuja also explains in the same way i.e. आत्मा is in the sense of paramātman and hence the context of the Ātman is flawless.

Kāryākhyānādhikaraṇam (3-3-18)

This is a one-sūtra-adhikaraṇa. The sūtra is कार्याख्या नादपूर्वम् (3-3-18) Since the rinsing of the mouth (with water) is a restatement of an act (already enjoined by smṛti), what has not been so enjoined elsewhere (is here intended). In the C.U. it is stated तस्माद्वा एतदशिष्यन्तः पुरस्ताच्चोपरिष्टाच्चाद्भिः परिदधति। (C.U. 5-2-2) Therefore when going to eat food, they surround it before and after with water. In the B.U. तद्विद्वांसः श्रोत्रिया अशिष्यन्त आयामन्त्यशित्वाचाचामन्त्येतमेव तदनमनग्नं कुर्वन्तो मन्यन्ते। (B.U. 6-1-14)

Śrotriyas who know this rinse the mouth with water when they are going to eat, and rinse the mouth with water after they have eaten, thinking that thereby they make the breath dressed.

The question is whether the śruti enjoins both viz. sipping of water and imagining of prāṇa as dressed by water or any one of them. The answer is since rinsing is enjoined on everyone by the smṛti, the latter act of meditation on the water as the dress of prāṇa is alone enjoined by the śruti.

Rāmānuja follows Śaṅkara.

Vallabha follows altogether a different line of interpretation. He takes up the consideration of the T.U. Passage तस्मादात्मन आकाश संभूतः। पृथिव्या ओषधयः ओषधीभ्योन्नम्। अन्नात्पुरुषः। स वा एष पुरुषोऽन्नरसमयः। (T.U. 2-1)

From this self, verily, ether arose, from earth herbs, from herbs food, from food the person. This verily is the person that consists of the essence of food. अन्नं ब्रह्मेति व्यजानात्। (T.U. 3-2) He knew that matter is Brahman. (T.U. 2-1) Those who worship food as Brahman, The puruṣa is the same or different from what is described in these passages is the question. The answer is that the Highest-self is described here in these passages because subsequently it is stated स वा एष। This He is indeed.

Vallabha presents another B.U. passage आत्मेत्येवोपासीत for consideration. The question is whether आत्मन् stands for जीवात्मन् or परमात्मन् and the sūtra answers प्राणनवदनादिकार्यैः... कृत्वा प्राणवागादित्वेनैकस्यैवात्मन आख्यानात् कथनादपूर्वम्। By actions such as breathing, speaking etc., the self by its breathe, speech etc. is stated, not the former.

According to P.M. Modi,[1] the sūtrakāra seems to discuss Brahman on the analogy of the explanation of Dharma given in the Jaimini sūtras. According to P.M. Modi, कार्याख्यान refers to B.U. 1-4-10. B.U. states, तद्धैतत्पश्यन्नृषिर्वामदेवः प्रतिपेदेऽहं मनुरभवं सूर्यश्चेति तदिदमप्येतर्हि य एवं वेदाऽहं ब्रह्मास्मीति स इदं सर्वं भवति तस्य ह न वा देवाश्चनाभूत्या ईशते आत्मा ह्येषां स भवति। (B.U. 1-4-10) Seeing this, indeed, the seer Vāmadeva knew, 'I was Manu and the Sun too.' This is so even now. Whoever knows thus, 'I am Brahman' becomes this all. Even gods cannot prevent his becoming thus, for he becomes their self.[18]

We are unable to pass any judgement on the merits of the interpretions offered by Śaṅkara and P.M. Modi. But, we have a hunch based on the following adhikaraṇa (and sūtra 3-3-19) that through apparently similar passages a new thing is taught. But this is regarding the interpretation and if this interpretation is even remotely acceptable, then perhaps Śaṅkara's v.v.s might appear to be more suited to the context.

Samānādhikaraṇam (3-3-19)

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I pp. 117-118

This is also, one-sūtra adhikaraṇa. The sūtra is समान एव चाभेदात्। (3-3-19) And in the same (Śākhā) also, it is thus (there is unity of vidyā) on account of non-difference (of the object of meditation). Passages in different texts of the same Śākhā form one vidyā, as the object of meditation is the same in them. For example in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, in the agnirahasya, it is said, स आत्मानमुपासीत मनोमयं प्राणशरीरं भारूपम्। (Śatapatha Brahmana X-6-3) Let him meditate on the self which consists of mind which has the prāṇa for its body, and light for its form. Again in the B.U. of the same śākhā it is said, मनोमयोऽयं पुरुषो भा:सत्यस्तस्मिन्नन्तर्हृदये यथा व्रीहिर्वा यवो वा स एष सर्वस्येशान: सर्वस्याधिपति: सर्वमिदं प्रशास्ति यदिदं किं च। (B.U. 5-6-6) That person consisting of mind, whose being is light, is within the heart, small like a grain of rice or barley. He is the ruler of all, the Lord of all, he rules all this whatever exists.

Rāmānuja, with the same passages explain the sūtra in a similar fashion.

Vallabha takes this sūtra as a part of the kāryākhyānadhikaraṇa and explains the sūtra, citing the passages तं त्वौपनिषदं पुरुषं पृच्छामि। (B.U. 3-9-26) 1 ask you of that Puruṣa described in the Upaniṣads. प्राणन्नेव प्राणो भवति, वदन् वाक्। (B.U. 1-4-7) while Breathing becomes breathe, speaking speech. (B.U. 1-4-8) This is dearer than the Sun.

About the text discussed by Śaṅkara P.M. Modi opnines, 'the sūtra, it must be stated, contains no indication about a reference to these texts. 'Evam' which should refer to some statement in the preceding sūtra means, according to Śaṅkara

यथा भिन्नासु शाखासु विद्यैकत्वं गुणोपसंहारश्च भवत्येवम्। समान is interpreted by him as एकस्यामपिशाखायाम् if समान is to refer to a शाखा we should have समानायाम् (feminine) instead of समाने (masculine).[1]

Sambandhādhikaraṇam (3-3-20 to 22)

The adhikaraṇa has the following three sūtras:

(i) संबन्धादेवमन्यत्रापि। (3-3-20)

(ii) न वा विशेषात्। (3-3-21)

(iii) दर्शयति च। (3-3-22)

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I p.121

The first sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is सम्बन्धादेवमन्यत्रापि। (3-3-20) In other cases also, on account of connection (i.e. the object of meditation is the same Brahman, we have to combine particulars) like this (i.e. as in the Śāṇḍilyavidyā). In the B.U. it is stated तद्यत्तत्सत्यमसौ स आदित्यो य एष एतस्मिन्मण्डले पुरषो यश्चायं दक्षिणेऽक्षन्पुरुष: (B.U. 5-5-2). Now what is the truth that is the Āditya, the person that dwells in yonder orb and the person in the right eye. Now here, different abodes are declared but they are to be connected because they have got one connecting link in the sentence सत्यं ब्रह्म. The true is Brahman, on the analogy of Śāṇḍilya vidyā.

This is a pūrvapakṣa sūtra.

Vallabha explains that even the jīva (अन्यत्राणि) also should be meditated like Brahman because the Brahman, dwells in it. तं यथा यथोपासते तथैव भवति तद्वैतान् भूत्वावति। (Mudgalopniṣad 9-3)[1] The manner in which he meditates on him, he becomes so, and He, becoming so, protects him.

P.M. Modi continues the discussion of apūrva...According to him, the sūtra evidently contains no suggestive word which would support Śaṅkara's v.v.[2]

The second sūtra is न वा विशेषात्। (3-3-21) Rather not, on account of difference (of above). Though the vidyā is one, but owing to the difference in abodes, the object of meditation becomes different. Śāṇḍilyavidyā continues to form the part of the discussion.

The third sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is दर्शयति च। (the scripture) also declared that the scripture clearly states that the attributes are to be kept separate and not combined. It compares the two persons which are distinct. Śaṅkara quotes C.U. तस्यैतस्य तदेव रूपं यदमुष्य रूपं यावमुष्य गेष्णौ तौ गेष्णौ यन्नाम तन्नाम। (C.U. 1-7-5) The form

---

1. In the Aṇubhāṣya (second Reprint 1980) ed. by Maganlal Shastri, this citation is attributed to Mudgalopaniṣad but in the Upaniṣad, (one Hundred and Twelve Upaniṣads and their Philosophy, Dr. A.N. Bhattāchārya, First edition, 1987) it is not found. In the Pandit S.T. Pathak's edition, the citation is not traced at all.
2. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I p. 121

of that person is the same as the form of the other person; the joints of the one are the joints of the other, the name of the one is the name of the other.

P.M. Modi has, as usual, the difference of opinion with Śaṅkara and other commentators, but does not point out any v.v. in place of Śaṅkara.[1]

Sambhṛtyadhikaraṇam (3-3-23)

This is a one-sūtra-adhikaraṇa. The sūtra is संभृतिद्युव्याप्त्यपि चातः। (3-3-23) For the same reason, the supporting (of the universe) and the pervading of the sky (attributed to Brahman) also (are not to be included in other meditations of Brahman).

The v.v. of the sūtra is ब्रह्मज्येष्ठा वीर्यासंभृतानि ब्रह्माग्रे ज्येष्ठं दिवमाततान। (This is, form of the khila of the Rāṇāyanīya Śākhā) Brahman is the best among the powers which are held together.

The best Brahman in the beginning stretched out the sky. These two qualities viz. sambhṛti and dyu-vyāpti are not to be included in other places treating of Brahma-vidyā on account of difference of abode. These qualities and those mentioned in other vidyās, like the Śāṇḍilya vidyā are of such a nature as to exclude each other. Brahman, though one, is meditated on in manifold way.

Rāmānuja, Vallabha name the same v.v. Madhava has a different v.v. quoting from a source which is not traceable.

What Śaṅkara has quoted as a v.v. is one of those v.v.s which should be beyond any pale of doubt for the simple reason that the words from the v.v. are incorporated in the sūtra. It is worth noting that even Vallabha who has been explaining the present sūtras in an altogether different way has also quoted the same passage quoted by Śaṅkara as v.v. P.M. Modi too has admitted this being the v.v. of the sūtra.[2]

Puruṣādyadhikaraṇam (3-3-24)

This is also a one-sūtra-adhikaraṇa. The sūtra is पुरुषविद्यायामिव चेतरेषामनाम्नात्। (3-3-24). And (since the qualities) as (mentioned in the puruṣavidyā of C.U.) are not mentioned in that of others (the two are not one). The questions related to the two vidyās viz. of

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I p. 123
2. Ibid, p. 125

the C.U. 3-16-1 and Tait. Āraṇyaka X64, which compare the sacrifice with life puruṣayajña. The details, the objectives in two cases different and the similarities are not important. So the puruṣavidyā or the C.U. cannot be combined with that in the Taittirīya text.

Rāmānuja explains the sūtra in a similar fashion, though he adopts the reading अपि in place of इव

B.N.K. Sharma writes, 'It is doubtful if the expression puruṣavidyā in the present sūtra is intended to refer to the puruṣa-yajña-vidyā of the Tāṇḍya, Paingi, Chāndogya and TA as presumed by Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja and other commentators. If the compound puruṣavidyā is construed as tatpuruṣa, it would not embrace the Chāndogya version. If it is construed as a karmadhāraya (puruṣa eva vidyā), the Taittirīya Āraṇyaka version would not be brought in. Does this show that the puruṣavidyā which the sūtrakāra is thinking of is quite different from what Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja and others have been discussing and purpose of this adhikaraṇa is also different.'[1]

Vallabha explains the sūtra in this way quoting the passage from the Taittirīyasaṁhitā सहस्रशीर्षा पुरुष: सहस्राक्ष: सहस्रपात्। स भूमिं विश्वतो वृत्त्वा अत्यतिष्ठद्दशाङ्गुलम्। पुरुष एवेदं सर्वं यद्भूतं यच्च भाव्यम्। (Tait. Saṁhitā 3-12-1) ब्रह्मविदाप्नोति परम्। (T.U. 3-1) स वा एष पुरुषोऽन्नरसमय: (T.U. 3-2) A thousand-headed puruṣa, with thousand eyes, and thousand feet, having encircled the earth from all sides, remained a span high. The person is everything, whatever was and to be. The knower of Brahman attains the highest. That puruṣa consists of saps of the food.

Here the word puruṣa occurs also in अन्नरसमय: passage. So the question is whether the attributes of being thousand headed etc. are to be combined in the puruṣa of food. The answer is in the negative as both the passages have different puruṣas in view.

P.M. Modi comments 'Thus Śaṅkara understands puruṣa in the expression puruṣavidyā to mean a man and his life is supposed to be a yajña. This is quite contrary to the meaning of

1. Sharma B.N.K., The Brahmasūtras and their Principal Commentaries Vol. III, p. 240.

the word puruṣa when the sūtrakāra speaks of the puruṣavidyā. In B.S. 1-2-26 the sūtrakāra says that Vaiśvānara is also called puruṣa in certain branch of the Veda (पुरुषमपि चैनमधीयते। B.S. 1-2-26). In that sūtra as well as in the present sūtra (3-3-24) it can be proved that the word puruṣa is used by the sūtrakāra in the sense of the rūpavad aspect of Brahman.'[1]

It is difficult to say which Upniṣadic or śruti passage might have been meant, by the sūtrakāra. But it may be stated that पुरुषविद्या is mentioned in general passages. But the attributes are not combined as this is not mentioned in the Veda. This is an illustration meant to support the उपसंहार of गुण. Would it be implausible to believe that, all the passages dealing with puruṣa-vidyā might be intended to be meant as v.v.s in the sūtra?

Vedhādyadhikaraṇam (3-3-25)

This is also a one-sūtra adhikaraṇa. The sūtra is वेधाद्यर्थभेदात्। (3-3-25) (The certain mantras relating to) piercing etc. (are not part of the Brahmavidyā) since they have a different meaning. Certain passages found in the beginning of the Upaniṣads do not belong to the main teaching of the Upaniṣads i.e. Brahmavidyā, as they are connected with the sacrificial acts. सर्वं प्रविध्य हृदयं प्रविध्य धमनीः प्रवृज्य शिरोऽभिप्रवृज्यः त्रिधा विपृक्तः। (in the beginning of the Ātharvanik Upaniṣad,) pierce him while, pierce his heart, crush his veins, crush his head, thrice crushed! This is found at the beginning of the Upaniṣad of Tāṇḍins. We have the mantra देव सवितः प्रसुव यज्ञम्। O God Savitar, produce the sacrifice. Then at the beginning of that of the Sāṭhyāyanins श्वेताश्वो हरितनीलोऽसि। Thou hast a white horse and art green as grass. Then at the beginning of the Kaṭhas and the Taittirīyakas शं नो मित्रः शं वरुणः May Mitra be propitious to us, and may Varuṇa be propitious and so on. These do not form the part of the Brahmavidyā.

Rāmānuja, in a broad outline, follows Śaṅkara with a slight shift, in the explanation. He recognises the Śāntimantra alone as the v.v. of the adhikaraṇa, According to him शं नो मित्रः etc is the v.v.

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmaasūtra, Part I, pp. 126-127

B.N.K. Sharma writes regarding the v.v. of Rāmānuja, 'This does violence to the wording of the sūtra, and the priority of place given to the words वेधादि therein.'[1]

Vallabha takes the B.U. passage for consideration

ते ह देवा उर्चुर्हन्तासुरान् यज्ञ उद्गीथेनात्ययामेति ते ह वाचमूचुस्त्वं न उद्गायेति तथेति तेभ्यो वागुदगायद् यो वाचि भोगस्तं देवेभ्य आगायद् यत्कल्याणं वदति तदात्मने ते विदुरनेन वै न उद्गात्रात्येष्यन्तीति तमभिद्रुत्य पाप्मनाविध्यन् यः स पाप्मा यदेवेदमप्रतिरूपं वदति, स एव पाप्मेति। (B.U. 1-3-12)

The gods said, 'Let us overcome the demons at the sacrifice through the udgītha. They said to speech, chant (the Udgītha) for us, 'so be it,' said speech and chanted for them. Whatever enjoyment there is in speech, it secured for the gods by chanting that it spoke well way for itself. The demons knew verily by this chanter, they will overcome us. They rushed upon it and pierce it with what is improper, that is that evil.

Vallabha takes अर्थ to mean God. Speech, prāṇa etc, are alloyed with sin because they are different from God.

Madhava interprets the sūtra in this way in the words of B.N.K. Sharma 'This adhikaraṇa establishes that such attributes of Brahman as putting down, the wicked, piercing and destroying them 'given in the Vedas (Rv. X 87 4-7) are not to be comprehended in meditation by all adhikārins.'[2] According to B.N.K. Sharma, 'The two commentators (viz. Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja) seem to have lost track of the true significance of the adhikaraṇa and to be pursuing shadows of their own creation.'[3]

According to P.M. Modi वेधादि seems to refer to M.U. 2-2-4

यदर्चिमद्यदणुभ्योऽणु च यस्मिल्लोका निहिता लोकिनश्च।

तदेतदक्षरं ब्रह्म स प्राणस्तदु वाङ्मनः।

तदेतत्सत्यं तदमृतं तद्वेद्धव्यं सोम्य विद्धि॥

धनुर्गृहीत्वौपनिषदं महास्त्रं शरं ह्युपासानिशितं संधीयते।

आयम्य तद्भावगतेन चेतसा लक्ष्यं तदेवाक्षरं सोम्य विद्धि॥

प्रणवो धनुः शरो ह्यात्मा ब्रह्म तल्लक्ष्यमुच्यते।

---

1. Sharma B.N.K., The Brahmasūtras and their Principal Commentaries, Vol. III, p. 324
2. Ibid p. 317
3. Ibid p. 325

अप्रमत्तेन वेद्धव्यं शरवत्तन्मयो भवेत्॥

What is luminous, what is subtler than the subtle, in which are placed all the worlds and those that people them, that is the imperishable Brahman. That is life, that is speech and mind. That is true, that is immortal. O beloved, that is to be known, know that.

Taking as the bow the great weapon of the Upaniṣads, one should place in it the arrow sharpened by meditation. Drawing it with a mind engaged in the contemplation of that (Brahman),

O beloved, know that Imperishable Brahman is the target. The syllable Aum is the bow, one's self indeed is the arrow. Brahman is spoken of as the target of that, It is to be hit without making a mistake. Thus one becomes united with it as the arrow (becomes one with the target).

This i.e. M.U. 2-2 to 4, is the v.v. suggested by P.M. Modi,[1] and we must admit that, this M.U. passage seems to be the right one, as the word वेधादि seems to suggest other weapons like bow, arrow etc. It is also more convincing to believe that the sūtrakāra, would prefer the Upaniṣadic passage to the other ritual and non-Upaniṣadic passage which Śaṅkara has chosen.

Further, the sūtra may be expounding the method of meditation as propounded in the Upaniṣads.

Hānyadhikaraṇam (3-326)

This is also a one-sūtra adhikaraṇa. Vallabha included this sūtra in the Vedhādyadhikaraṇaṁ. Madhva takes this and the following sūtra as constituting one adhikaraṇa. For P.M. Modi, this sūtra and the following sūtra are a part of the adhikaraṇa beginning with the previous sūtra.

The sūtra is हानौ तूपायनशब्दशेषत्वात्कुशाच्छन्दस्तुत्युपगानवत्तदुक्तम्। (3-3-26) Where the discarding (of good and evil) is mentioned (the obtaining of this good and evil by others has to be included) on account of this word obtaining being supplementary (to the statement about discarding) as in case of kuśas, the metre, the praise and the recitation. This has been stated (in the purvamīmāṁsā).

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, pp. 130-131

The following passage from the C.U. is The v.v. of the sūtra, according to Śaṅkara.

अश्व इव रोमाणि विधूय पापं चन्द्र इव राहोर्मुखात्प्रमुच्य धूत्वा शरीरमकृतं कृतात्मा ब्रह्मलोकमभिसंभवामि। (C.U. 8-13-1)

Shaking of all evil as a horse shakes his hair, and shaking off the body as the moon frees herself from the mouth of Rāhu, I obtain self-made and satisfied the uncreated world of Brahman. Kau. U. says तत्सुकृतदुष्कृते विधूनुते तस्य प्रिया ज्ञातयः सुकृतमुपयन्त्यप्रिया दुष्कृतम्। (Kau. U. 1-4) He shakes off his good and his evil deeds. His beloved relations obtain the good, his unbeloved relatives the evil he has done तथा विद्वान्नामरूपाद्विमुक्तः परात्परं पुरषमुपैति दिव्यम्। (M.U. 3-2-8) Then knowing, shaking off good and evil he reaches the highest oneness, free from passion.

The first passage merely mentions a man's shaking off his deeds. This gives rise to a discussion, whether these deeds when shaken off are obtained by his friends and enemies or not.

The reply is although the text mentions only the getting rid of the deeds, yet the obtaining of them by others must necessarily be added because the statement concerning the latter is merely supplementary to the former. And this is analogous to the kuśas, the metres, the praise and the singing.

Śaṅkara offers one more explanation of विधूय which would mean to tremble, to shake and not to discard. This would mean that good and evil still cling to a person who attains knowledge, though their effects are retarded owing to knowledge. Śaṅkara rejects this meaning stating that unless the person discards evil, he is not eligible for knowledge.

Vallabha takes the M.U. passage तथा विद्वान्नामरूपाद्विमुक्तः परात्परं पुरुषमुपैति दिव्यम्। (M.U. 3-2-8) Then knowing, shaking off good and evil, he reaches the highest oneness, free from passions as the v.v. Vallabha takes the word हानौ in the sense of departure of jīva from Brahman. At the time of the parting of jīva from Brahman, the bliss etc. are clouded. But when a contact of जीव with Brahman is reestablished, then they become manifest. Upāyaṇa in the sense of Sāmyopāyana. He takes the तदुक्तम् as refering to sūtra तद्‌गुणसारत्वात्तद्व्यपदेशः प्राज्ञवत्। (2-3-29)

Rāmānuja explains the sūtra more or less in the same manner as that of Śaṅkara.

P.M. Modi, as noted above, continues the discussion of the passage cited as the v.v. of the previous sūtra.[1]

According to him, the word उपायन may refer to the word लक्ष्य in the M.U. 2-2-4. It may also refer to the reward of meditation on the praṇava in other Upaniṣads. According to him, हानि or even the root हा 'to abandon' does not occur in any one of the śrutis quoted by Śaṅkara.

However it may be stated that there is a word having the sense of उपायन in the śruti तत्सुकृतदुष्कृते विधुनुते तस्य प्रिया ज्ञात्य: सुकृतमुपयन्त्यप्रिया दुष्कृतम्। (Kau. U. 1-4) Moreover, it is not difficult to see the connection between हा and विधूय, विधूनुते. So perhaps Śaṅkara's v.v.s are rather closer to the sūtras than what P.M. Modi thinks them to be.

Sāmparāyādhikaraṇam (3-3-27, 28)

(i) सांपराये तर्तव्याभावात्तथा ह्यन्ये। (3-3-27)

(ii) छन्दत उभयथाविरोधात्। (3-3-28)

The first sūtra is सांपराये तर्तव्याभावात्तथा ह्यन्ये। (3-3-27) At the time of departure, (he frees himself from the effects of his works), there being nothing to be reached (by him on the way to Brahmaloka through these works), for thus others declare. Kau. U. says स आगच्छति विरजां नदीं तां मनसैवान्येति तत्सुकृतदुष्कृते विधूनुते। (Kau. U. 1-4)

He comes to Virajā here he shakes off his good deeds and evil deeds. Now the question is whether the deceased man frees himself from his good and evil deeds on the way to Brahman or at the time of his leaving the body. The answer is that, the deceased man frees himself from the good and evil at the time of his departure from the body, as there is nothing to be reached by him on the way through his good and evil works. Other śrutis also say so अश्व इव रोमाणि विधूय पापम्। (C.U. 8-13-1) shaking off all evil as a horse shakes his hair.

Rāmānuja says that there are no further pleasures and pains to be enjoyed as the result of good and evil deeds different from the obtaining of Brahman which is the fruit of knowledge.

This sūtra, according to Madhva, 'refutes an objection of pūrvapakṣa that even conceding that the upāsanā of muktas is not

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, pp. 132-133

governed by mandates, they may still be carried on with a view to overcoming certain obstacles of unforeseen impediments which may arise in their new lives. The sūtra refuting the objection points out that the state of Mukti (Sāmparāya) is, by hypothesis that is completely free from all impediments and adversities. The śrutis declare that the Mukta once for all crosses over all obstacles and impediments.'[1] (अत्र पिताऽपिता भवति... तीर्णो हि तदा सर्वान्छोकान्हृदयस्य भवति। (B.U. 4-3-22)

Vallabha takes up the B.U. passage as a v.v. नैनं पाप्मा तरति सर्वं पाप्मानं तरति। (B.U. 4-4-23) Sin does not cross him. He crosses over all evils. On the path of devotion (sāmparāya), there remains nothing to be crossed and one who is a sinner, even after obtaining knowledge is different from a devotee.

P.M. Modi, continues the topic of meditation through Aum. According to him, the v.v. of this sūtra would be a passage of the P.U. ऋग्भिरेत यजुर्भिरन्तरिक्षं स सामभिर्यत्तत्कवयो वेदयन्ते। तमोंकारेणैवायतनेनान्वेति विद्वान्यत्तच्छान्तमजरममृतमभयं परं चेति। (P.U. 5-7) With the Ṛg one atlains this world, with the Yajus the interspace, and with the Sāman, to that which the seers recognise. That the wise one attains even by the mere sound Aum as support that which is tranquil, unaging, immortal, fearless and supreme.[2]

Śaṅkara, is consistent with his philosophy as he states

सांपराये गमन एव देहादपसर्पणे इदं विद्यासामर्थ्यात्सुकृतदुष्कृतहानं भवति...। and his v.v. is also appropriate to the context. In P.M. Modi's case, the v.v. suggested by him does not seem to reflect the sūtra.

The second sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is छन्दत: उभयथाविरोधात्। (3-3-28) According to his liking, (he gets rid of good and evil while living) since there is no contradiction between the two.

Śaṅkara continues explaining the soul's departure (सांपराय) while P.M. Modi begins a new adhikaraṇa from this sūtra and takes up the question of रूपवत् and अरूपवत् ब्रह्मन्.

P.M. Modi does not point out any v.v. for the pratijñā in this sūtra, while for Śaṅkara, obviously, as he is resolving the śruti stated in the previous sūtra, does not have any v.v.

---

1. Sharma B.N.K., The Brahmasūtras and their Principal Commentaries Vol. III, p. 329
2. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, pp. 136-138

Gaterarthavattvādhikaraṇam (3-3-29 to 30)

This adhikaraṇa has the following two sūtras viz.

(i) गतेरर्थवत्त्वमुभयथाऽन्यथा हि विरोधः। (3-3-29)

(ii) उपपन्नस्तल्लक्षणार्थोपलब्धेर्लोकवत्। (3-3-30)

The first sūtra is गतेरर्थवत्त्वमुभयथाऽन्यथा हि विरोधः। (3-3-29) A meaning has to be given to the going (on the path of the gods) in a twofold manner, for otherwise (there would result) a contradiction. Journey on the path of the gods is not for the worshippers of Nirguṇa Brahman whose getting knowledge is equilvalvent to becoming Brahman. If the journey applies to him also, then texts like पुण्यपापे विधूय निरञ्जनः परमं साम्यमुपैति। (M.U. 3-2-3) Shaking of good and evil, and free from stain obtaining the supreme equality with the Highest, becomes meaningless. How can one who has become Brahman go to another place?

Vallabha interprets the sūtra from the Maryādā and Puṣṭi point of view.

P.M. Modi explains the sūtra from the रूपवत् and अरूपवत् Brahman point of view. He quotes the śruti passages to indicate गति, in the sense of मोक्ष. अशब्दमस्पर्शमरूपमव्ययं ततोऽरसं नित्यमगन्धवच्च यत्। अनाद्यनन्तं महतः परं ध्रुवं निचाय्य तन्मृत्युमुखात्प्रमुच्यते।। (Kaṭha U. 1-3-15) The self without sound, without touch, and without form, undecaying is likewise without taste, eternal, without smell, without beginning, without end, beyond the great, abiding, by discerning that, one is freed from the face of death. तथा विद्वान्नामरूपाद्विमुक्तः परात्परं पुरुषमुपैति दिव्यम् (M.U. 3-1-8) Similarly, knowing freed from name and form, approaches the divine Highest person.

For Śaṅkara, the word गति in the sense of reaching approaching does not hold any meaning as far as nirguṇa Brahman is concerned.

The second sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is उपपन्नस्तल्लक्षणार्थोपलब्धेर्लोकवत्। (3-3-30) (the twofold view adopted above) is reasonable for we observe a purpose characterised thereby (i.e. a purpose for going) as in the world.

The texts mention certain results which can be obtained by the worshipper only by going to different places, such as mounting the couch and holding conversation with Brahman. But

a journey is meaningless for one whose ignorance is destroyed by knowledge.

Vallabha explains the sūtra from the bhakti point of view. P.M. Modi continues the explaining of the sūtra from the रूपवत् and अरूपवत् Brahman point of view.[1]

Aniyamādhikaraṇam (3-3-31)

This is a one-sūtra-adhikaraṇa. The sūtra is अनियम: सर्वासामविरोध: शब्दानुमानाभ्याम्। (3-3-31) There is no restriction (as to the going on the path of gods as it applies to all (vidyās of the Saguṇa Brahman). There is no contradiction as is seen from the śruti and smṛti.

Śaṅkara maintaints that going on the path of the gods is connected equally with all those vidyās, which have prosperity for their aim. Scripture declares that not only those who knew the pañcāgnividyā (C.U. 5-10-1) तद्य इत्थं विदु:।

ये चेमेऽरण्ये श्रद्धा तप इत्युपास्ते। (C.U. 5-10-1) who know this and those who are in the forest, meditate on faith and austerities, but also those who understand other vidyās and those who in the forest follow faith and austerities proceed on the path of the gods. Gītā also says so: शुक्लकृष्णे गती ह्येते जगत: शाश्वते मते। एकया यात्यनावृत्तिमन्ययाऽवर्तते पुन:।। (B.G. 8-26) These two, the white and the black path, are known as the eternal paths of the world, on the one man goes not to return, on the other he again returns.

Rāmānuja maintains that all those who meditate on Brahman irrespective of the distinction between saguṇa and nirguṇa after death on the path of the gods. Rāmānuja, reads सर्वेषाम् all devotees, and not सर्वासाम् all saguṇa vidyās as Śaṅkara does.

P.M. Modi continues the explanation of the sūtra from the रूपवत् and अरूपवत् Brahman point of view.[2] According to him, the sūtra means, it is not necessary that a meditator should meditate on all the attributes of Brahman collected by sūtrakāra in B.S. 1-3. For P.M. Modi, the question of गति is not at all discussed in this pāda. It occurs in sūtras 4-3-7 to 14. गति is naturally a topic proper for discussion in the..

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, pp. 142-143
2. Ibid, pp. 144-146

Yāvadadhikārādhikaraṇam (3-3-32).

This is also a one-sūtra-adhikaraṇa.[1] The sūtra is यावदधिकारमवस्थितिराधिकारिकाणाम् (3-3-32) Of those who have an office to fulfill, there is subsistence (of the body) as long as the office lasts. The sūtra says that ordinarily a person after attaining knowledge is not reborn. But the case is different with those who name a mission to fulfill. Śaṅkara enters into a detailed discussion giving illustrations from the Paurāṇic lores.

For P.M. Modi, there is a different scheme. According to him in the sūtras 31-33 sūtrakāra discusses three types of attributes. Sūtra 31 deals with attributes or thoughts which belongs to Brahman and most of which have been collected by the sūtrakāra in B.S. 1 to 3. There are other attributes or thoughts which belong to अक्षर the Immutable, these are dealt with in sūtra 33. There is a third type of attributes or thoughts of Brahman which belong to the official duties or which are useful to officiating priests (आधिकारिकाणाम्). These seem to have been dealt with in sūtra.[2]

Akṣarādhyadhikaraṇam (3-3-33)

This is also a one-sūtra-adhikaraṇa. The sūtra is

अक्षरधियां त्ववरोधः सामान्यतद्भावाभ्यामौपसदवत्तदुक्तम्। (3-3-33)

But the (negative) conception concerning the Immutable are to be comprehended (in all meditations on tne Immutable) on account of the similarity and of the object being the same as in the case of the Upasada (the offerings). This has been stated (in the Pūrvamīmāṁsā 3-3-9).

In the B.U. we read एतद्वै तदक्षरं गार्गि ब्राह्मणा अभिवदन्त्यस्थूल-मनण्वह्रस्वादीर्घमलोहितमस्नेहम्। (B.U. 3-8-8)

O Gārgi the Brāhmaṇas call this Akṣara. It is neither gross not fine not short nor long, neither red nor unctuous.

In the M.U. also we read, अथ परा यया तदक्षरमधिगम्यते यत्तद्रेश्यमग्राह्यमगोत्रमवर्णम्। (M.U. 1-1-5) The higher knowledge is that by which the Indestructible is apprehended, That which cannot be seen, not siezed, which has no family, nor caste.

---

1. S. Radhakrishnan has wrongly shown this sūtra to be a part of the previous adhikaraṇa i.e. aniyamādhikaraṇam, It seems to be a slip of pen. See his Brahmasūtra, p. 486
2. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, pp. 150-151

Here, in these passages, we have negative descriptions of the Immutable. Are they to be treated as two separate vidyās or as one vidyā? Objector would say that negation is valid only for the text in which it occurs and for others, the sūtra says that such denials are to be comprehended since the method of teaching Brahman through denial is the same and the object of meditation is the same, i.e. the Immutable Brahman. The case is similar to the Upasada or offerings. Though the mantras are found only in the Sāma Veda, the priests of the Yajurveda also use then.

P.M. Modi, here at least for once, concurrs with Śaṅkara regarding the v.v.s of the sūtra.[1]

Iyadādhikaraṇam (3-3-34)

This is also a one-sūtra-adhikaraṇa. The sūtra is इयदामननात्। (3-3-34) On account of the same thing being proclaimed. In the M.U. we read.

द्वा सुपर्णा सयुजा सखाया समानं वृक्षं परिषस्वजाते।

तयोरन्य.: पिप्पलं स्वाद्वत्त्यनश्नन्न्येऽभिचाकशीति।। (M.U. 3-1-1-)

Two birds, inseparable friends, cling to the same tree. One of them eats the sweet fruit, the other looks on without eating.

In the Kaṭha U. we read

ऋतं पिबन्तौ सुकृतस्य लोके गुहां प्रविष्टौ परमे परार्धे।

छायातपौ ब्रह्मविदो वदन्ति पञ्चाग्नयो ये च त्रिणाचिकेता: ।। (Kaṭha U. 3-1)

There are the two drinking their reward in the world of their own works, entered into tne cave, dwelling on the highest summit. Those who know Brahman call them shade and light, likewise, those householders who perform Triṇāciketa sacrifice. The sūtra maintains that these two texts form one vidyā, for both describe the same Lord as existing, in the form of the individual. The object is to teach about the Supreme Brahman and show the identity of the individual soul and the Supreme. As the object of meditation is one, the vidyās are also one.

Madhva quotes from some Kaunṭharvya श्रुति which is not extant now.

P.M. Modi takes this and the following sūtra as one sūtra and takes the adhikaraṇa as comprising these sūtras in this way.

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, pp. 156-157

इयदामननादन्तरा भूतग्रामवत्स्वात्मनः। (3-3-34 and 35) According to him इयदामननात् refers to a śruti in which परमात्मन् is said to be 'of this much size' i.e. of a small size. So probably, according to him,

Kaṭha U. is referred to

अङ्गुष्ठमात्रः पुरुषोमध्य आत्मनि तिष्ठति।
ईशानो भूतभव्यस्य न ततो विजुगुप्सत एतद्वै तत्॥
अंगुष्ठमात्रः पुरुषो ज्योतिरिवाधूमकः।
ईशानो भूतभव्यस्य स एवाद्य स उ श्व एतद्वै तत्॥

(Katha U. 2-1-12, 13)

The person of the size of a thumb resides in the middle of the body. After knowing him, who is the Lord of the past and the future, one does not shrink. This verily is that.

The person of the size of a thumb resides in the middle of the body, like a flame without smoke. He is the Lord of the past and future. He is the same today and same tomorrow.

This verily is that. According to P.M. Modi,[1] v.v.s pointed out by Śaṅkara are already discussed (गुहां प्रविष्टावात्मानौ हि तद्दर्शनात्। 1-2-11) B.S. and स्थित्यदनाभ्यां च। 1-3-7 B.S.) and hence there is no reason why these two śrutis be discussed again. The same can be held against P.M. Modi, as his v.v.s have also been discussed (शब्दादेव प्रमितेः। 1-3-24 B.S). As Śaṅkara is dealing with the गुणोपसंहार - collection of attributes, it is legitimate for him to discuss some śrutis again from a different point of view.

Antarādhikaraṇam (3-3-35, 36)

This is a two-sūtra-adhikaraṇa. The following are the sūtras viz.

The first sūtra is अन्तरा भूतग्रामवत्स्वात्मनः। (3-3-35) (there is the same teaching) as the self is within all, as in the case of the aggregate of the elements. In the B.U. two places we read (B.U. 3-4-1, 3-5-1) Tell me, Brahman which is present to intuition, not hidden, the self who is within all.

The objector says that the repetition intimates the separateness of the two vidyās, otherwise repetition would be meaningless. The sūtra refutes the objection by stating that the

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, pp. 160-161

Supreme self is the object in both cases since two different selves cannot be simultaneously the innermost of all in the same body even as none of the elements constituing the body can be the innermost of all, in the true sense of the term. Of course, one element may be relatively speaking to be inside another. So the same self is taught in both the texts, Śaṅkara does not rule out the possibility of the S.U. passage

एको देवः सर्वभूतेषु गूढः सर्वव्यापी सर्वभूतान्तरात्मा। (S.U. 6-11)

The one God hidden in all beings, all pervading, the inner most self of all the beings. (S.U. 6-11) being the v.v. of the sūtra. Śaṅkara writes भूतग्रामवदिति श्रुत्यन्तरं निदर्शयति।

Rāmānuja argues that the repetition of question and answer serves the purpose of showing that the same Brahman is the cause of breathing etc. Rāmānuja takes a passage from the B.U. as a v.v.

यत्साक्षादपरोक्षाद्ब्रह्म य आत्मा सर्वान्तरस्तन्मे व्याचक्ष्व। (B.U. 3-4-1)

यः प्राणेन प्राणिति स त आत्मा सर्वान्तरो योऽपानेनापानमिति स त आत्मा। (B.U. 3-4-1) न दृष्टेर्द्रष्टारं पश्येः। न श्रुतेः श्रोतारं शृणुथाः। न विज्ञातेर्विज्ञातारं विजानीथाः। एष त आत्मा सर्वान्तरः। अतोऽन्यदार्तम्। (B.U. 3-4-2)

...यदेव साक्षादपरोक्षाद्ब्रह्म य आत्मा सर्वान्तरस्तन्मे आचक्ष्व। (B.U. 3-5-1)

What is the direct Brahman, supersensuous, what the Ātman the inmost of all, tell me that.

Who lives by the Prāṇa –he, your Ātman, the inmost of all, one who by the Apāna (wind) moves down, he, your Ātman.

One should not see the seer of sight, one should not hear the hearer of hearing, one should not think of the thinker of thought? one should not know the knower of knowledge– – this one, your Ātman, the inmost of all. Everything other than this is distressing.

Vallabha takes the word अन्तरा meaning a hindrance and explains the sūtra in this way. 'The Lord is the self' this knowledge is a hindrance (अन्तरा) in the bliss of singing devotional songs as the knowledge aggregate of wife, son, animals etc. are a hindrance in the experience of self-realisation.

B.N.K. Sharma believes that the word antarā in the sūtra does not suggest Śaṅkara's v.v. He writes, 'It is a far cry indeed from antarā an indeclinable (avyaya) in Sanskrit grammer to 'antaraḥ'

of the śruti: ya atmā sarvāntaraḥ' (B.U. 3-4-1)[1] P.M. Modi objects to the method of raising a pūrvapakṣa by Śaṅkara. According to P.M. Modi, in this sūtra Śaṅkara raises a pūrvapakṣa because the same topic is repeated in the texts concerned, while in the preceding sūtra, he raises a doubt because different, things are mentioned in the text concerned. Thus it would seem as if a doubt may be raised on any account.......'[2] B.N.K. Sharma also raises the same objection against Śaṅkara's method of raising a pūrvapakṣa.[3]

Well, one cannot really object to Śaṅkara's method of raising a doubt, because, the avowed objective of this pāda according to Śaṅkara is गुणोपसंहार i.e. collection of attributes, and hence, he has to exhaust all the possible doubts regarding it. So, if the different things are mentioned in the text, the doubt is legitimate and if in the two passages, the matter is the same, then also, we think and Śaṅkara thinks so, doubt would be in order.

But apart from this polemics, Rāmānuja's v.v. seems to be better suited to the context, though both these modern learned scholars cited above do not agree to Rāmānuja's v.v. either.

The second sūtra is अन्यथा भेदानुपत्तिरिति चेन्नोपदेशान्तरवत्। (3-3-36) If it be said that otherwise the separation (of the teachings) cannot be accounted for, (we say) not so, (it is) like (the repetition in) another teaching. The reference is to the C.U. 6 where there is repetition intended to make the student understand the subject convincingly. In the passage तत्त्वमसि teaching is repeated nine times and yet there is no vidyābheda.

Though Rāmānuja takes the sūtras 35-36 together, the interpretation is similar to that of Śaṅkara.

According to P.M. Modi, the sūtrakāra seems to refer to a statement in the śruti according to which Brahman and the soul are within an individual's body without being identical. So, according to P.M. Modi, śrutis like द्वा सुपर्णा... M.U. 3-1-1 and ऋतं

---

1. Sharma B.N.K., Brahmasūtra and their Principal Commentaries, Vol. III, pp. 374-75 and fn 10 on the page 375
2. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, part I, p.161.
3. Sharma B.N.K., Brahmasūtra and their Principal Commentaries, Vol. III p. 374.

पिबन्तौ.. Kaṭha U. 3-1 are the v.v.s of the sūtra. His interpretation of the sūtra is based upon the reading अभेद instead of भेद which is Śaṅkara's.[1] It may be noted that भेद reading is adopted in addition to Śaṅkara, by Bhāskara, Rāmānuja and Madhva, while Vallabha has अभेद reading.

Vyatihārādhikaraṇam (3-3-37)

This is a one-sūtra-adhikaraṇa. The sūtra is व्यतिहारो विशिंषन्ति हीतरवत् (3-3-37). There is a reciprocity (of meditations) for the scriptures distinguish, (this) as in other cases. Aitareya Āraṇyaka text 2-2-4 reads तद्योऽहं सोऽसौ योऽसौ सोऽहम्। What I am that he is, what he is, that I am.

The question is raised whether the meditation is to be of a reciprocal nature i.e. identifying the worshipper with the being in the sun and inversely the being in the sun with the worshipper, or only in the first way. The sūtra answers that he is to be meditated in both ways.

For Rāmānuja, this and the next sūtras are a part of the antaratvādhikaraṇam (3-3-35 to 37), and so he continues the discussion of the śruti (B.U. 3-4-1) in the 3-3-35.

Vallabha explains the sūtra from the bhakti point of view as he has been doing since the beginning of the pāda

Madhva, continues the discussion of the gradations of the अधिकारिन्ऽ.

P.M. Modi takes a different section as starting from this sūtra extending upto the sūtra 42. He has got a different scheme to explain these sūtras. According to him, the sūtra states an interchange of attributes between two aspects of Brahman: rūpavat and arūpavat. According to P.M. Modi, this sūtra is a statement of a conclusion and therefore, it does not refer to any śrutis.[2]

Satyādyadhikaraṇam (3-3-38)

This is a one-sūtra-adhikaraṇa. The sūtra is सैव हि सत्यादय:। (3-3-38) The same (satyavidyā is taught in both places for attributes like) satya and others are found in both places.

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, pp. 162-164.
2. Ibid, p. 169

According to Śaṅkara, this sūtra has a reference to the B.U. passage स यो हैतं महद्यक्षं प्रथमजं वेद सत्यं ब्रह्म। (b.u. 5-4-1) तद्यत्तत्सत्यमसौ स आदित्यो य एष एतस्मिन्मण्डले पुरुषो यश्चायं दक्षिणेऽक्षन्पुरुषः। (B.U. 5-5-2) Whoever knows this great glorious first born as the true Brahman.... Now what is the True that is the Āditya, the-person that dwells in yonder orb, and the person in the right eye.

The doubt arises whether the text enjoins two vidyās of the True or one only. The pūrvapakṣin maintains 'two'. For the text declares two different results, one in the earlier passage जयतीमांल्लोकान् (B.U. 5-4-1) He conquers these worlds, and the other one later on हन्ति पाप्मानं जहाति च। (B.U. 5-5-3,4) He destroyes evil and leaves it. The sūtra holds that there is only one vidyā, of the Time because of the statement तद्यत्तत्सत्यम्। (B.U. 5-5-2) That which is the True and refers back to that True which is treated in B.U.

Rāmānuja discusses the C.U. passages (6-3-2, 6-8-6, 6-9-1). The sūtra maintains that the subject of all the passages of the C.U. is the same supreme deity and hence, this is indicated by ऐतदात्म्यमिदं सर्वं तत्सत्यं स आत्मा। (C.U. 6-8-7) And that which is the subtle essence (the root of all) this whole world has for itself. That is the true. That is the Self. According to B.N.K. Sharma, Rāmānuja has done less than justice to the sūtra. According to him, if the passage quoted by Rāmānuja was a v.v., then, in the sūtra, ऐतदात्म्य should have found a place.[1]

According to P.M. Modi, whose arrangement of the sūtra is also different, the sūtra may refer to any śruti, which may characterise one of the aspects of the Brahman.

Kāmādyadhikārādhikaraṇam (3-3-39)

This is, also a one-sūtra-adhikaraṇa. The sūtra is कामादीतरत्र तत्र चायतनादिभ्यः (3-3-39) Qualities (like) desire etc. (mentioned in the C.U. 8-1-1) (are to be inserted) in the other and there on account of the abode and so on.

In the C.U. we read एष आत्माऽपहतपाप्मा विजरो विमृत्युर्विशोको विजिघत्सोऽपिपासः सत्यकामः सत्यसंकल्पः। (C.U. 8-1-15) This self is free from sin, free from old age, from death and grief, from hunger

1. Sharma B.N.K. Brahmasūtra and their Principal Commentaries, Vol. III p. 380

and thirst, whose desires are true, whose imaginations are true. In the B.U. we read, स वा एष महानज आत्मा योऽयं विज्ञानमय: प्राणेषु य एषोऽन्तर्हदय आकाशस्तस्मिञ्छेते सर्वस्य वशी। (B.U. 4-4-22)

He is that great unborn self who consists of knowledge, is surrounded by the prāṇas, the ether within the heart. In it there reposes the ruler of all. The sūtra maintains that the two passages form one teaching and the qualities mentioned in each passage are to be combined in the other.

For many points are common to both. There is the same abode, the Lord, Who is the object of meditation and so. But there is a difference too. The C.U. passages treat of Brahman with qualities and the B.U. passages treat of Brahman without qualities. The sūtra prescribes the combination of qualities, for the purpose of glorification of Brahman, and not for meditation. Śaṅkara writes गुणवतस्तु ब्रह्मण एकत्वाद्विभूतिप्रदर्शनायायं गुणोपसंहार: सुत्रितो नोपासनायेति द्रष्टव्यम्। Rāmānuja also cites the C.U. passage (8-1-1 C.U.) and B.U. passage (4-4-22)

अथ यदिदमस्मिन्ब्रह्मपुरे दहरं पुण्डरीकं वेश्म दहरोऽस्मिन्नन्तराकाशस्तस्मि-न्यदन्तस्तदन्वेष्टव्यम्।

स वा एष महानज आत्मा योऽयं विज्ञानमय: प्राणेषु य एषोऽन्तर्हदय आकाशस्तस्मिञ्छेते सर्वस्य वशी सर्वस्येशान:। (B.U. 4-4-22)

Now, what this, in this Brahma-city, the Dahara lotus-abode, the Dahara-within this, Ākāśa, what is inside that, that should be searched for.

He, verily, this great unborn Ātman, -who this, constituted of Vijñāna, among the Prāṇas, who, this, within the heart, Ākāśa, sleeps in that, controller of all, ruler of all.

Rāmānuja maintains that there is only one Vidyā enunciated in both of these passages.. The reason is that the abode of meditation in both is the same i.e, the heart.

Madhva continues explaining the sūtra with his gradation theory.

Vallabha explains the sūtra from the bhakti point of view.

P.M. Modi has a very elaborate way of explaining the sūtras. We will rest content with merely stating his position briefly. P.M. Modi has a different scheme to explain the sūtras. For him, the

sūtra should be सत्यादय: (of the previous sūtra) कामादितरत्र तत्र चायतनादिभ्य: ।[1]

Moreover, he suggests one more change in the reading by Śaṅkara कामादीतरत्र is changed to कामादितस्त्र. According to P.M. Modi, in sūtras 11 and 39, three groups of attributes are mentioned viz. (1) One beginning with आनन्द (2) a second beginning with सत्य and (3) a third group of attributes of which आयतन is the first. In the three pādas of the first adhyāya, these three groups of attributes are referred to respectively. To wit, 1-1-2 refers to आनन्द, 1-2-1 refers to सत्य that is सत्यसंकल्प,

1-3-1 refers to आयतन in the द्युभ्वाद्यायतन. P.M. Modi, applies his theory of two fold Brahman in explaining these sūtras.[2]

Ādarādhikaraṇam (3-3-40, 41)

This adhikaraṇa has the following two sūtras via. (i) आदरादलोप: । (3-3-40) उपस्थितेऽतस्तद्वचनात्। (3-3-41)

The first sūtra is आदरादलोप: (3-3-40) On account of respect shown, there is non-omission. The sūtra gives the opponent's view that prāṇāgnihotra which enjoins the offering of food to the priests should be observed even in the days of fasting. There should be no omission of it.

Pūrvapakṣa holds that as the priority of prāṇāgnihotra is insisted upon in the passage of the Jābālins पूर्वोऽतिथिभ्यो एवं तत्। which expresses special interest in and respect for it, it is to be offered without fail. There is a reference to the C.U. passage तद्यद्भक्तं प्रथममागच्छेत्तद्धोमीयं स यां प्रथममाहुतिं जुहुयात्तां जुहुयात्प्राणाय स्वाहा।... य एतदेवं विद्वानग्निहोत्रं जुहोति। (C.U. 5-19-1, 5-24-2). Therefore that food which may come first should be an offering. The first offering he offers should offer saying, hail to the prāṇa breath. Knowing it thus, one offers the fire sacrifice.

Rāmānuja takes sūtra 39-41 as one adhikaraṇa and hence, continues the discussion of the passages quoted in the previous sūtra. The sūtra maintains that the qualities of control and truthful wishes are not be omitted as they are stated with emphasis.

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, pp. 168-169
2. Ibid, pp. 169-178

P.M. Modi takes this sūtra as a part of the adhikaraṇa comprising 37 to 42 sūtras.[1]

The second sūtra is उपस्थितेऽतस्तद्वचनात्। (3-3-41) When food is served from that (the offering is to be made) for so the text declares. Only on the days when the food is taken, the first portion is to be offered to the prāṇas and not on fasting days.

The siddhānta is given in this sūtra. Prāṇāgnihotra is to be performed only with the food first eaten, so that, the host may be able to perform his prāṇāgnihotra. But it will be too much to expect this Śruti-passage to tell us that the prāṇāgnihotra is to be performed in all cases, even when there is no food, and no occasion for dinner.

According to P.M. Modi, there is no word in this sūtra or the following which would justify a reference to C.U. 5-19 to 24. Further, according to him, the topic falls outside the scope of ब्रह्मजिज्ञासा।[2]

Tannirdhāraṇādhikaraṇam (3-3-42) This is a one-sūtra adhikaraṇa. The sūtra is तन्निर्धारणानियमस्तद्दृष्टेः पृथग्ध्यप्रतिबन्धः फलम्। (3-3-42) (There is) non-restriction of the meditations[3] assertions concerning them (sacrificial acts) because this is seen (in scripture); a separate result i.e. non-obstruction (of the success of the sacrifice) (belongs to them).

Certain meditations are mentioned in connection with some sacrifices. The sūtra says that these meditations are not a part of the sacrifices. ओमित्येतदक्षरमुद्गीथमुपासीत।- (C.U. 1-1-1) Let a man meditate on the syllable Aum, as Udgītha. The problem discussed, as Thibaut explains is 'The question is raised whether the meditations enjoined in the Upaniṣads, on certain parts or elements of sacrificial acts, are permanently connected with the latter, i.e. are to be undertaken, whenever, the sacrificial is performed or not.'[4] The siddhānta is that these Upāsanas have no

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, pp. 178-179
2. Ibid, p. 181
3. Radhakrishnan translates निर्धारण by 'assertions' But V.H. Date's translation in Vedānta Explained Vol. II 'Meditation' seems to be better.
4. Thibaut George, The Vedānta sūtras, Part II, p. 253 footnote-I

necessary connection with the sacrifices. This follows from the śruti तेनोभौ कुरुतो यश्चैतदेवं वेद यश्च न वेद। (C.U. 1-1-10)

Therefore, both he who knows this and he who does not perform the sacrifice. Śruti allows both persons who know and who do not know (the Upāsanā) to perform the sacrifice. Another reason is the indication that devotion to vidyā is said to bear additional fruit over and above the fruits of the sacrifices in that devotion to the Upāsanā brings about the result of the sacrifices much earlier and without any obstacles. This implies a difference between the performance of the sacrifice with and without knowledge of the vidyā. The ignorant performers have their own reward but the learned ones receive rewards of superior quality.

Rāmānuja follows Śaṅkara *mutatis mutandis*.

Vallabha interprets the sūtra from the bhakti point of view.

Madhva explains the sūtra in the following manner. The question raised is will it not be sufficient for the Upāsaka to carry out both Śravaṇa and manana alone, or only śravaṇa or only manana or dhyāna alone or is it absolutely necessary to carry out one and all of them? The siddhānta is that it appears from the disposition of the vidhi आत्मा वा अरे द्रष्टव्यः श्रोतव्यो मन्तव्यो निदिध्यासितव्यः। The self is indeed to be seen, heard, meditated, and contemplated that each of the means is equally important and every one of them bears the stamp of being enjoined with a view to attaining direct vision of Brahman.

P.M. Modi suggests the reading पृथग्ध्यप्रतिबन्धः instead of पृथग्ध्यप्रतिबन्धः and then explains the sūtra: There is no objection from the side of the śruti, to taking प्रधान and पुरुष as two separate thoughts on Brahman.[1]

Pradānādhikaraṇam (3-3-43)

This is a one-sūtra-adhikaraṇa. The sūtra is प्रदानवदेव तदुक्तम्। (3-3-43) Even as in the case of the offerings (Vāyu and Prāṇa must be held apart). This has been stated (in the pūrvamīmāṁsā sūtra). In the B.U. we read वदिष्याम्येवाहमिति वाग्दध्रे। (B.S. 1-5-21) Voice held 'I shall speak.' This passage determines prāṇa to be the best among the organs of the body viz. speech and so on and vāyu to be the best among the Devas viz. Agni and so on.

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, pp. 182-185

Similarly in the C.U. we read वायुर्वाव संवर्गः। (C.U. 4-3-6) and प्राणोवाव संवर्गः (C.U. 4-3-3) Vāyu indeed is the absorber. Breath indeed is the absorber. Are these treated to be as separate or not? The sūtra says that they should be treated as separate. The texts represent Vāyu and Prāṇa as different. Even as the offerings are given separately to Indra, the ruler, the monarch and the sovereign according to his different functions, though he is one God, so also the meditations on Vāyu and Prāṇa are to be kept separate.

According to Rāmānuja, the passage for consideration is तद्य इहात्मानमनुविद्य व्रजन्त्येतांश्च सत्यान्कामान्। (C.U. 8-1-6)

Those who depart hence, without having found here the self and those real desires for them. Rāmānuja points out that there is first a meditation on the Highest Self and then separately a meditation on qualities. The opponent maintains that as the two can be comprised in one meditation, it is not necessary to repeat the meditations. The sūtra holds that, the meditation has to be repeated for there is a difference between the Supreme in its essential nature and as possessing the qualities.

Madhva explains the sūtra in the following way. The procedure, laid down for properly carrying out śravaṇa etc. with the instruction, guidance, and grace of the Guru (pradānavad eva) has the backing of the śruti. The śruti text is आचार्यवान्पुरुषो वेद। (C.U. 6-14-2)

P.M. Modi adopts the reading प्रधानवदेव तदुक्तम्। According to P.M. Modi, no satisfactory interpretation has been put forth for the word प्रदान by any commentator. In his opinion, the sūtra explains that पुरुष aspect should be meditated as the aspect is meditated upon. According to him, the wording of the sūtra does not support the v.v. and interpretation of the sūtra by Śaṅkara.[1]

According to B.N.K. Sharma, interpretation by P.M. Modi is far removed from the subject Sādhana adhyāya as it can be.'[2]

It may be noted that, Madhva's interpretation of the sūtra seems to be better and more plausible, as his v.v. refers to the

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, pp. 189-190
2. Sharma B.N.K., Brahmasūtra and their Principal Commentaries Vol. III, p. 406

necessity of a teacher which is quite consistent in this Sādhana-adhyāya. The word may be taken to mean गुरुकृपा grace by the teacher.

Liṅgabhūyastvādhikaraṇam (3-3-44 to 52)

This adhikaraṇa has nine sūtras:

(i) लिङ्गभूयस्त्वात्तद्धि बलीयस्तदपि। (2-3-44)

(ii) पूर्वविकल्पः प्रकरणात्स्यात्क्रिया मानसवत्। (3-3-45)

(iii) अतिदेशाच्च। (3-3-46)

(iv) विद्यैव तु निर्धारणात्। (3-3-47)

(v) दर्शनाच्च। (3-3-48)

(vi) श्रुत्यादिबलीयस्त्वाच्च न बाधः। (3-3-49)

(vii) अनुबन्धादिभ्यः प्रज्ञान्तरपृथक्त्ववद्दृष्टश्च तदुक्तम्। (3-3-50)

(viii) न सामान्यादप्युलब्धेर्मृत्युवन्न हि लोकोपत्तिः। (3-3-51)

(ix) परेण च शब्दस्य ताद्विध्यं भूयसवात्त्वनुबन्धः। (3-3-52)

The first sūtra is लिङ्गभूयस्त्वात्तद्धिबलीयस्तदपि। (3-3-44) On account of the profusion of indicatory marks (the fires of the mind, speech etc. mentioned in the Agni-Rahasya section of the B.U. are not parts of the sacrificial action) for (this, the indicatory mark) is stronger (than the general subject matter. That also (has been stated in the Pūrvamīmāṁsā sūtra).

In the Agni-Rahasya section of the B.U. it has been stated वाक्चितः प्राणचितश्चक्षुश्चितः श्रोत्रचितः कर्मचितोऽग्निचितः। (S.B. X. 5-3-3-12) Here certain fires are named after mind, speech, breath, eye, ears, rites, The question is raised whether they are parts of the sacrifice or are independent meditations. The sūtra asserts that they are independent meditations as there are indicatory marks.

These indicatory marks are subjects of meditation and are stronger than the context or general subject matter.

Rāmānuja takes this sūtra as dealing with the question whether the daharavidyā of Mahānārayaṇa U. (also known as Nārāyaṇa U. XI) is the same as that which is mentioned in the previous section of the Upaniṣad (X) and answers that the object of meditation is Nārāyaṇa in all Brahma-vidyās.

पद्मकोशप्रतीकाशं हृदयं चाप्यधोमुखम्। (Mahānārāyaṇa U. 13-2)

दहरं विपापं परवेश्मभूतं वत्पुण्डरीकं पुरमध्यसंस्थम्।

तत्रापि दहरं गगनं विशोकस्तस्मिन्यदन्तस्तदुपासितव्यम्।। (Mahānārāyaṇa U. 12-3)[1]

The heart is similar to the lotus-bloom and facing downward.

In that space of the heart, which is free from sin, the abode of the highest, a lotus, stationed in the middle of the city, the sky in that space is without grief, that which is in that should be meditated.

It is a moot question whether, Brahmasūtrakāra had this Upaniṣad which might be of a late origin, in view, and some would go to the extent of branding it as a sectarian Upaniṣad.[2]

Vallabha takes up the following passages from the C.U. सोऽहं भगवो मन्त्रविदेवास्मि। (C.U. 7-1-3), यो वै भूमा तत्सुखम्। (C.U. 7-23-1) यत्र नान्यत् पश्यति नान्यच्छृणोति नान्यद्विजानाति स भूमा। (C.U. 7-24-1)

O venerable sir, I am only like one knowing the words (and not a knower of self). The infinite is happines. Where one sees nothing else, hears nothing else, understands nothing else, that is infinite.

P.M. Modi, continues the discussion of the arūpavat and rūpavat Brahman. P.M. Modi objects to the Śaṅkara's applying liṅgabhūyastva to the Agnirahasya Brāhmaṇa and showing that the fires in question are vidyātmaka and not kriyātmaka.[3] To our mind, there is nothing objectionable if Śaṅkara takes up a particular passage and clears a possible doubt.

The second sūtra is पूर्वविकल्पः प्रकरणात्स्यात्क्रियामानसवत्। (3-3-45) (The fire spoken of) is a particular form of the preceding one on account of the subject-matter, it is a part of the sacrifice as in the case of the mānasa-cup.

The pūrvapakṣa points out that in the offering to Prajāpati where the earth is regarded as the cup and the sea as the Soma (Tāṇḍya Brāhmaṇa 4-9, Taittiriya Saṁhitā 7-3-1). Though it is a mental act only, it is treated as a part of the sacrifice, so also these fires, though mental are parts of the sacrifice and not independent meditations on account of the subject matter.

---

1. Both references from one Hundred and Twelve Upniṣads and their Philosophy by Dr. A.K. Bhattacharya, p. 141
2. Sharma T.R., Studies in the Sectarian Upaniṣads, p. 25
3. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I pp. 190-193

They are alternative forms of the first mentioned fire, विकल्पविशेष।

From this Rāmānuja takes up the interpretation similar to that of Śaṅkara with the same passage for consideration.

According to Madhva, this sūtra begins a new adhikaraṇa and tackles the problem of Guru. According to Madhva, this adhikaraṇa establishes the superior efficacy of the Guru's grace as the indispensable means in respect of sādhanā without undermining the necessary personal effort in carrying out the sādhanā on the part of mumukṣu. Guruprasāda is the most powerful factor in achieving aparokṣajñāna. This is proved by a number of indications in the śrutis (C.U. 4-4-5, 6-9, 10-14, Satyakāma Jābāla Ākhyāyikā etc.) Where, the disciples seek to be instructed again by their own Gurus. It may happen that after having placed oneself under a Guru, one may come into contact with another and a more competent one who can bestow grace on him. Then what should a disciple do? The sūtra says there is option (vikalpa) for a change from a former (pūrva) preceptor (to a better or an equally competent one) taking into account the bestowal by him of fullness of grace and enlightenment, as there is in the mental act (क्रियमानसवत्) of dhyāna with regard to two or more forms of Brahman, chosen for meditation, the fruits of which are equal.[1]

P.M. Modi refers to various Muṇḍaka U. passages, in connection with his specific theory of Brahman.[2]

The third sūtra is अतिदेशाच्च (3-3-46) And on account of extension.

The opponent gives another reason in support of his view. As the text attributes the qualities of the actual fire to others, they are a part of the sacrifice.

(Śatapatha Brahmana X-5-3-11) Thirtysix thousand shining Agnis, each of them is as large as the previously mentioned Agni.

Rāmānuja follows Śaṅkara.

---

1. See also Sharma B.N.K., Brahmasūtra and their Principal Commentaries, Vol. III, p. 415.
2. Vide Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmsūtra, Part-I, p. 194

According to Vallabha, the pūrvapakṣa maintains that the world which is nothing but one mode of name and form is an extension of Brahman only and hence, it is a different form of knowledge, as said in the C.U. नामैवेतन्नामोपास्स्व। (C.U. 9-9-4) This is the very name, meditate on name.

Madhva quotes from some Pauṣyāyaṇa śruti exhorting the disciples in the words of their teachers to seek fulfilment of their spiritual lives by seeking light and guidance from their betters, in addition to their present Gurus.

According to P.M. Modi, the sūtra refers to येनाक्षरं पुरुष वेद सत्यं प्रोवाच तां तत्त्वतो ब्रह्मविद्याम्। (M.U. 1-2-13)

Let the knowing teach in its very truth that knowledge about Brahman by which one knows the Imperishable person, the true. According to him, this is an atideśa of the akṣara mentioned in the M.U. 1-l-5,6, i.e. puruṣa is no different from akṣara.[1]

The next sūtra is विद्यैव तु निर्धारणात्। (3-3-47) But (the fires) are indeed a meditation only on account of the assertion. This refers to the opponent's position. The fires constitute a meditation for the text says ते हैते विद्याचित एव, विद्यया हैवैत एवं विपश्चिता भवन्ति। (S.B. X-5-3-12) They are made of knowledge only.... By knowledge and meditation, they are made for him who thus knows!

Rāmānuja's view is similar to that of Śaṅkara.

According to Madhva, jñāna is necessary for mokṣa as the śruti declares नान्यः पन्था विद्यतेऽयनाय। (M.U.) There is no other way than knowledge for mokṣa. According to P.M. Modi, the sūtra reiterates the view that meditation on puruṣa is Brahmavidyā,

The fifth sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is दर्शनाच्च। (3-3-48) And because (indicatory marks of that) are seen (in the text). These are the same as shown in the sūtra.

Rāmānuja attaches this sūtra to the previous one and make one sūtra.

According to Madhva, the sūtra maintains that Upāsanā consisting of śravaṇa, manana and dhyāna is essential.

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, pp. 195-196

According to P.M. Modi, दर्शनात्, refers to a śruti and not to the sūtrakara's words as Śaṅkara does.[1]

The next sūtra is श्रुत्यादिबलीयस्त्वाच्च न बाध: (3-3-49) (And the view that the fires constitute an independent meditation) cannot be refuted owing to the greater force of the śruti. The Pūrvamīmāṁsā lays down the rule that scriptural statement (śruti), indicatory mark, (liṅga) and syntactical connection (vākya) are of greater force than the subject matter (प्रकरण) and these three means of proof confirm the view that the fires are independent meditations. ते हैते विद्याचित एव is the śrutipramāṇa. They are piled up by knowledge. सर्वदा सर्वाणि भूतानि चिन्वन्त्यपि स्वपते। All beings at all times pile up (those fires) for him who knows thus, even while he sleeps. Then the proof of the syntactical connection is विद्याया हैववैत एवंविदश्चिता भवन्ति। For through knowledge alone, these are piled up for one who knows thus,

Rāmānuja follows Śaṅkara.

Vallabha maintains that the sarvātmabhāva is superior because as per the dictum laid down in the Jaimini Sūtra: 'The Śruti and Liṅgapramāṇas are more powerful than the vākyapramāṇa. The word ātmā is used in the sense of the Lord and there is nothing higher than the Lord. This is quite clear in the passage from the C.U. 7-1-3. Nārada did not question further as to what was higher than Bhūmā and hence Bhūmā i.e. Lord is the highest.

According to Madhva, the Sūtra lays emphasis on the indispensability of upāsanā consisting of Śravaṇa, manana and dhyāna.

P.M. Modi explains the sūtra in this way 'Pradhāna or arūpavat is proved to be more powerful'. He finds Śaṅkara's interpretation repetitive.[2]

The next sūtra is अनुबन्धादिभ्य: प्रज्ञान्तर पृथकत्वद्दृष्टश्च तदुक्तम्। (3-3-50) From the connection and so on, (the fires constitute a separate meditation) even as other cognitions are separate; (and as Jaimini) has explained, it is seen (that certain facts can be true even if they are detached from the context). The fires (agnividyā)

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, p. 198
2. Ibid, p. 192.200

form a separate meditation even as Śāṇḍilyavidyā, Daharavidyā, etc. are separate meditations, though mentioned along with sacrificial acts. It is also seen in the sacrificial portion of the Vedas.

Rāmānuja's way of interpreting the sūtra is similar to that of Śaṅkara.

Vallabha continues the discussion of the C.U. passage in which Nārada approaches Sanatkumāra with a desire to know.

P.M. Modi explains the sūtra applying his concept of puruṣa.

The next sūtra is न सामान्यादप्युपलब्धेर्मृत्युवन्न हि लोकापत्तिः। (3-3-51) Not in spite of similarity (can the fires constitute parts of an action), for it is seen (on the ground of scriptural texts that they are independent), as in the case of death, for the world does not become (fire because it, resembles a fire in some points).

Śaṅkara explains that one thing may resemble another in certain respects yet the two things are different. Death applies to fire and the being in the sun स वा एष मृत्युर्य एष एतस्मिन्मण्डले पुरुषः। (S.B. x-5-2-3) Fire and the being in the sun are not one. C.U. also says असौ वाव लोको गौतमाग्निस्तस्यादित्य एव समित्। (C.U. 5-4-1) The world is fire, the sun itself is its fuel. From this it does not follow that the fuel and the world actually become fire.

Rāmānuja holds that the transference of the property of one thing to another does not indicate any identity between them.

According to P.M. Modi, the sūtra says that though puruṣa is not mṛtyu in spite of a common characteristic between the two is given as an illustration to prove that puruṣa is not a loka though there is सामान्य between the two. According to P.M. Modi, likely v.v. is from the Kaṭha V.

यस्य ब्रह्म च क्षत्रं चोभे भवत ओदनः।
मृत्युर्यस्योपसेचनं क इत्था वेद यत्र सः॥ (Kaṭha U. 1-2)

Brahman is an eater like death, both of them devour the world, अदन is the common characteristic of the two, but even on account of this सामान्य, Brahman does not become Mṛtyu.[1]

The last sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is परेण च शब्दस्य ताद्विध्यं भूयस्त्वात्त्वनुबन्धः। (3-3-52) And from the subsequent (Brāhmaṇa)

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, pp. 204-208

the fact of the text being such (enjoining a separate meditation) (is known). The connection, however, (of the imaginary fires with the real one is) due to the abundance (of the latter which are imaginatively connected with the meditation).

In a subsequent Brāhmaṇa, it is said विद्यया तदारोहन्ति यत्र कामा परां गताः। त तत्र दक्षिणा यन्ति नाविद्वांसस्तपस्विनः। (S.B. x-5-2-23) By knowledge, they ascend there where all wishes are attained. Those skilled in work do not go there. Here knowledge is praised as superior to work. From this we find that the fires form a meditation. The connection of the fires with the actual fire is not because they form part of the sacrifice, but because many of the attributes of the real fire are imaginatively connected with the fire of meditation.

Rāmānuja explains in the manner of Śaṅkara. Vallabha explains the sūtra in this way. आत्मन एव इदम्। this śrutivākya is identical with the subsequent Śrutivākya सर्वमाप्नोति सर्वशः। It gets everything on all sides. Thus it is not possible to come into contact with the world for a person with a complete sense of identity. This is one more reason, because more reasons make a case stronger.

According to Madhva the sūtra emphasizes the grace of the Lord.

According to P.M. Modi, Śaṅkara is not reliable in the interpretation of the sūtra. He poses a rhetorical question lambasting Śaṅkara's method of interpretation. 'Is a commentator reliable in his work when he adds so many words to a sūtra in order to draw out from it a sense consistent with what he thinks to be the purpose of the sūtra?'[1]

Aikātmyādhikaraṇam (3-3-53, 54) This adhikaraṇa has two sūtras:

(i) एक आत्मनः शरीरे भावात्। (3-3-53)

(ii) व्यतिरेकस्तद्भावभावित्वान्न तूपलब्धिवत्। (3-3-54)

The first sūtra is एक आत्मनः शरीरे भावात्। (3-3-53) Some (maintain the nonexistence) (of a separate) self on account of the existence (of the self) (only) where there is a body.

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, pp. 209-210

According to Śaṅkara, this sūtra gives the Carvāka or materialist point of view. Consciousness is not seen to exist separate from the body and hence, consciousness is merely a quality of the body.

Rāmānuja does not deal with the question of the materialist view of the self but raises the question of the self of the meditating devotee. Some maintain that the soul of the devotee has in meditation only those attributes which belong to it in the embodied state such as jñātṛtva and the like because the self is in the body.

According to Vallabha, this sūtra explains that, the Lord gets embodied in the body of a devotee. सोऽश्नुते सर्वान् कामान् सह ब्रह्मणा विपश्चिता। (T.U. 2-1-1-) He enjoys all desires along with Brahman, intelligent,

Madhva deals with the anāditva of bhakti, jñāna and other forms of yogyatā of the jīvas, and disposes of this argument in the sūtra.

According to P.M. Modi, this sūtra does not give a Lokāyatika or materialist view. According to him, the sūtra deals with the पूर्वविकल्प: the option of meditating on पुरुष or the rūpavat aspect of Brahman.[1]

The second sūtra is व्यतिरेकस्तद्भावभावित्वान्न तूपलब्धिवत्। (3-3-54) There is separation (of the self from the body) because its existence does not depend on the existence of that (viz. the body), but there is not (non separation) as in the case of cognitive consciousness. According to Śaṅkara, the sūtra refutes the objection raised in the previous sūtra, and maintains that self is separate from the body.

Rāmānuja maintains that the pratyagātman with form as knower is not to be meditated upon, but the Parmātman who is different from the Ātman in the Saṁsāra state is to be by the released.

Vallabha continues to interpret the sūtras from the bhakti point of view.

According to P. M. Modi, the soul exists without (व्यतिरेक) a body. Prin. R.D. Karmarkar poses a question 'Could it be that

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, pp. 210-211

these two sūtras are an interpolation? The interpretation by other bhāṣyakāras is not satisfactory either. '[1]

Aṅgāvabaddhādhikaraṇam (3-3-55, 56)

The adhikaraṇa has two sūtras: (i) अङ्गावबद्धास्तु न शाखासु हि प्रतिवेदम्। (3-3-55) (ii) मन्त्रादिवदविरोध:। (3-3-56)

The adhikaraṇa has no particular topic of v.v. in view but, deals with the question whether meditations are one in all the branches of the Vedas as the mantras are made use of in all Śākhās.

Bhūmajyāyastvādhikaraṇam (3-3-57)

This is a one-sūtra-adhikaraṇa. The sūtra is भूम्न: क्रतुवज्ज्यास्त्वं यथा हि दर्शयति। (3-3-57) Importance is given to the meditation) on the entire form (of Vaiśvānara) as in the case of sacrifice, for so (scripture) shows.

Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja take the the C.U. passage from the Vaiśvānara vidyā as the v.v. औपमन्यव कं त्वमात्मानमुपास्स इति दिवमेव भगवो राजन्निति होवाचैष वै सुतेजा आत्मा वैश्वानरो यं त्वमात्मानमुपास्से। (C.U. 5-12-1) and further तस्य ह वा एतस्यात्मनो वैश्वानरस्य मूर्धैव सुतेजाश्चक्षुर्विश्वरूप: प्राण: पृथग्वर्त्मात्मा संदेहो बहुलो बस्तिरेव रयि: पृथिव्येव पादौ। (C.U. 5-18-2) O son of Upamanyu, on what do you meditate on the self? (He replied), 'Heaven only, Venerable King'. He said, 'The self you meditate on in the Universal self (called) the good light, of this Universal self, the head indeed is the good light, the eye is the universal form, breath is (air) of varied course, the body in the full, the bladder is wealth, the feet are earth'.

Here, the object of meditation is the entire self. According to Vallabha, Sarvātmabhāva is superior to everything and it is not a worldly thing, like a scarifice. स एव अधस्तात्। अथ आत्मादेश:। (C.U. 7-25-1) Thus the Śruti preaches.

P. M. Modi, continues the discussion of an उपासना referring to the C.U. 5-18-1 and 2. There is not much of a difference between the interpretation of Śaṅkara and P.M. Modi, having the same v.v.[2]

---

1. Karmarkar R.D., Śrībhāṣya of Rāmānuja, Part III, Notes p. 224
2. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra part I, pp. 226-228

Śabdādibhedādhikaraṇam (3-3-58)

The sūtra is नानाशब्दादिभेदात् (3-3-58) (The meditations are) different on account of the difference of words and the like. The different meditations are to be kept separate, for they use different words.

Rāmānuja gives the instances of Vidyās such as Bhūmāvidyā, Daharavidyā, Upakosala vidyā, Śāṇḍilyavidyā and so an, and says that these are different vidyās on account of the difference in words and the like.

P.M. Modi connects नाना with अङ्गावबद्धा: ब्रह्मोपासना: । and holds that, the meditations on Brahman resting upon the parts of अङ्ग s of Brahman are different or independent of the others.[1]

Vikalpādhikaraṇam (3-3-59)

The sūtra विकल्पोऽविशिष्टफलत्वात्। (3-3-59) maintains that all forms of meditations have the same result. The bhāṣyakāras explain the sūtra in the same way but different philosophical contents.

Kāmyādhikaraṇam (3-3-60)

The sūtra काम्यास्तु यथाकामं समुच्चीयरेन्न वा पूर्वहेत्वभावात्। (3-3-60) maintains that the meditations connected with desires may according to one's own choice be combined or not, on account of the absence of former reason.

Yath āṣrayabhāvādhikaraṇam (3-3-61 to 66)

We may, out of consideration for the symmentery of the thesis, just record here this last adhikaraṇa which winds up the discussion on the meditations. Śaṅkara and other commentators take up the discussion of the Udgīthavidyā (C.U. 1-1-) while P.M. Modi discusses the Vaiśvānaravidyā (C.U. 5-18-2).[2]

3-4-1 to 52

Now the fourth pāda of the third adhyāya begins. About the content of this pāda V.S. Ghate writes, 'The last pāda of the third adhyāya deals with miscellaneous questions regarding Brahmavidyā and its auxiliaries, for instance, the following: that the knowledge of the Brahman is not subordinate to action, but

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, p. 230
2. Ibid, pp. 238-240

independent that hence for the parivrājins only vidyā is prescribed, though the actions enjoined by the scriptures such as sacrifices, conduct of certain kinds etc, are conducive to the rise of vidyā in the mind that the duties proper for the different stages of life, (āśrama-karmāṇi) are obligatory on him who does not strive after mukti that bālya, the childlike innocence state of mind, pāṇḍitya learning, and mauna 'the condition of a muni whose characteristic mark is preeminence of knowledge are three conditions enjoined for the Saṁnyāsin etc.[1]

Śaṅkara writes in the beginning of the first sūtra of this pāda, अथेदानीमौपनिषदमात्मज्ञानं किमधिकारिद्वारेण कर्मण्येवानुप्रविशत्याहोस्वित् स्वतन्त्रमेवपुरुषार्थसाधनं भवतीति मीमांसमान: सिद्धान्तेनैव तावदुपक्रमते।

The sūtrakāra at present, enters on an inquiry whether the knowledge of the self which is derived from the Upaniṣads is connected with works through him who is entitled to perform the works or is an independent means of accomplishing the purpose of man.

This shows that Śaṅkara begins with the first sūtra itself without dealing with the general purport of the pāda. Rāmānuja writes गुणोपसंहारानुपसंहारफला विधैकत्वनानात्वचिन्ता कृता, इदानीं विद्यात: पुरुषार्थ: उत विद्याङ्गकात्कर्मण इति चिन्त्यते।

So according to Rāmānuja, the objective of this pāda is to consider whether release takes place through knowledge or through the actions subsidiary to knowledge.

According to Madhva, ज्ञानसामर्थ्यम् is the purport of this pāda.[2]

Vallabha explains उपासनाभेदेप्युपासयाभेदाच्छाखान्तरोक्त-धर्माणामप्युपसंहार: कर्तुमुचित इति पूर्वपादे निरूपितमिति तन्न्यायेनोत्तरकाण्ड-प्रतिपाद्यब्रह्मफलकसर्वात्मभावेऽपि पूर्वकाण्डप्रतिपादितकर्मणामुपसंहार: प्राप्नोति न वेत्यधुना विचार्यते।

In the previous pāda it was established that, though Upāsanās are different, the upāsya being non-different, it is but proper that the attributes from all the branches are to be collected. So now, in

1. Ghate V.S., The Vedānta, p. 131
2. Vide also Sharma B.N.K., Brahmasūtra and their Principal Commentaries, Vol. III, p, 495

this pāda, in the self-being-everythingness the karmas described in the former kāṇḍa are to be collected or not is to be described.

With this introductory presentation, we may begin with the first adhikaraṇa.

Puruṣārthādhikaraṇam (3-4-1 to 17)

This, rather a long adhikaraṇa has the following 17 sūtras:

(i) पुरुषार्थोऽतः शब्दादिति बादरायणः। (3-4-1)

(ii) शेषत्वात्पुरुषार्थवादो यथाऽन्येष्विति जैमिनिः। (3-4-2)

(iii) आचारदर्शनात्। (3-4-3)

(iv) तच्छ्रुतेः। (3-4-4)

(v) समन्वारम्भणात्। (3-4-5)

(vi) तद्वतो विधानात्। (3-4-6)

(vii) नियमाच्च। (3-4-7)

(viii) अधिकोपदेशात्तु बादरायणस्यैव तद्दर्शनात्। (3-4-8)

(ix) तुल्यं तु दर्शनम्। (3-4-9)

(x) असार्वित्रकी। (3-4-10)

(xi) विभागः शतवत्। (3-4-11)

(xii) अध्ययनमात्रवतः। (3-4-12)

(xiii) ना विशेषात्। (3-4-13)

(xiv) स्तुतयेऽनुमतिर्वा। (3-4-14)

(xv) कामकारेण वैके। (3-4-15)

(xvi) उपमर्दं च। (3-4-16)

(xvii) उध्वरितः सु च शब्दे हि। (3-4-17)

The first sūtra is पुरुषार्थोऽतः शब्दादिति बादरायणः (3-4-1) From this (the knowledge of Brahman results) the purpose of man on account of scriptural statement, thus (says) Bādarāyaṇa. The sūtra expressing the opinion of Bādarāyaṇa states that knowledge of Brahman leads to liberation and is not a part of sacrificial acts. This is borne out by the śrutis. It is quite patent that all those śruti passages which teach liberation can be the topic of this sūtra. There are several śrutis which deal with liberation-puruṣārtha. तरति शोकमात्मवित्। (CU.9-1-3) One who knows the self crosses grief, स यो ह वै तत्परमं ब्रह्म वेद ब्रह्मैव भवति। (M.U. 3-2-9) He who knows that Highest Brahman becomes Brahman. ब्रह्मविदाप्नोति परम्। (T.U. 2-1-1) He who knows Brahman attains the Highest. आचार्यवान्पुरुषो वेद तस्य तावदेव चिरंयावन्न विमोक्ष्येऽथ संपत्स्ये। (C.U. 6-14-

2) He alone who has got a spiritual teacher knows the Brahman; he has to wait for liberation till the fall of his body; but no sooner does it fall than he becomes one with sat.

Rāmānuja, on this line quotes the passages from S.U. (3-8), M.U. (3-2-8) and so on.

Vallabha lays the emphasis on grace by quoting the passage नायमात्मा प्रवचनेन लभ्यः। (Kaṭha U. 2-22) This self cannot be obtained by discourse यमेवैष वृणुते तेन लभ्यः। (Kaṭha U. 2-22) He whom He chooses obtains the self.

Vallabha also quotes from Mahānārāyaṇa U. अतः परं नान्यदणीयसं हि परात् परं यन्महतो महान्तं (Mahānārāyaṇa U. 1-1)[1]

There is nothing subtler, higher than It. It is greater than the great. As it is one, unmanifest of manifold forms, everything, ancient one, and beyond darkness.

According to Madhva, the opening sūtra establishes the wide powers of aparokṣa jñāna to confer all puruṣārthas inclusive of heaven and mokṣa. He quotes from the M.U.

यं यं लोकं मनसा संविभाति विशुद्धसत्त्वः कामयते यांश्च कामान्।

तं तं लोकं जायते तांश्च कामान् तस्मादात्मज्ञं ह्यर्चयेद्भूतिकामः। (M.U. 3-1-10)

Whatever world a man of purified nature thinks of in his mind and whatever desires he desires, all these worlds and all these desires he attains. Therefore, let him who desires prosperity worship the knower of the self.

From what is quoted above, it would be clear that, any śruti passage having some connection with final release is quotable as a v.v.

P.M. Modi quotes passages like विद्ययाऽमृतमश्नुते (I.U, 11) By knowledge, he attains immortality and so on. He writes about Śaṅkara. 'It is strange that Śaṅkara does not quote तमेव विदित्वाऽतिमृत्युमेति (S.U. 3-8) on which he lays great emphasis elsewhere.'[2] The learned professor is protesting too much.

---

1. Also called Nārāyaṇa U. See, one Hundred and Twelve Upaniṣads and their Philosophy, by Dr. A.N. Bhattacharya, p. 137
2. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, p. 243

The second sūtra is शेषत्वात्पुरुषार्थवादो यथाऽन्येष्विति जैमिनिः। (3-4-2) On account of the (self) being in a subordinate relation (to action) (the statements as to the fruits of the knowledge of the self) are mere praise of the agent, even as in other cases, thus says Jaimini.

The knowledge of the self has no independent fruit of its own for it stands in a subordinate relation to sacrificial action. The passages which mention such fruits are to be taken as arthavāda or praise. This is the view of Jaimini.

For Vallabha and Madhva, the sūtras 2 to 7 present the opinion of Jaimini, and Pūrvapakṣa for reversing the primacy of aparokṣajñāna.

The third sūtra is आचारदर्शनात्। (3-4-3) Because we find (from the scriptures) certain lines of conduct. Instances of Janaka and Aśvapati are given to illustrate that, they had attained liberation and yet they performed the sacrifices, though there was no need for them to perform sacrifices. जनको ह वैदेहो बहुदक्षिणेन यज्ञेनेजे। (B.U. 3-1-1) यक्ष्यमाणो वै भगवन्तोऽहमस्मि।(C.U. 5-11-5) Janaka, the king of the Videhas, sacrificed with a sacrifice at which many presents were given to the priests. Sirs, I am to perform a sacrifice. According to Vallabha, the sūtra explains that, those who have realised Brahman do perform actions and, Vallabha gives the illustration of the sages like Vasiṣṭha who have realised Brahman and also perform the works. Those who do not perform works are in fact, incapable of it.

Śaṅkara is correct in referring to the the śruti-texts which mention the people like Janaka, though a knower of Brahman, performed sacrifices.

The fourth sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is तच्छ्रुतेः (3-4-4) But the scriptures declare. C.U. states यदेव विद्यया करोति श्रद्धयोपनिषदा तदेव वीर्यवत्तरं भवति। (C.U. 1-1-10) What indeed one performs with knowledge, faith, and meditation, that indeed becomes more powerful. This text unequivocally states that, knowledge is subordinate to work. Vidyā or knowledge is directly represented as a means of work.

Rāmānuja, Madhva and Vallabha follow suit.

Śaṅkara has hit the nail on the head by pointing out a śrutipassage which subordinates knowledge to Karma.

The fifth sūtra is समन्वारम्भणात्। (3-4-5) On account of the taking hold together. B.U. says त विद्याकर्मणी समन्वारभेते। (B.U. 4-4-2) Then both his knowledge and his work take hold of him. The two together manifest their fruits. Knowledge, therefore, is not indepedent.

The śruti quoted by Śaṅkara is the v.v. of the sūtra beyond any doubt as the formation of the verb in the śruti has been incorporated in the sūtra.

The sixth sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is तद्वतो विधानात्। (3-4-6) And because the scriptures enjoin work for such. The scriptures enjoin work for those who have knowledge of the Vedas, which includes the knowledge of the self. So knowledge does not produce any result independently. C.U. reads आचार्यकुलाद्वेदमधीत्य यथाविधानं गुरोः कर्मातिशेषेणाभिसमावृत्य कुटुम्बे शुचौ देशे स्वाध्यायमधीयानः। (C.U. 8-15-1) He who has learnt the Veda from a family of teachers according to rule, in the time left over from doing work for the teacher, he after having come back again settles down in a home of his own, continues the study of what he has learnt in holy places.

Rāmānuja follows Śaṅkara.

Vallabha explains the sūtra thus. There is an injunction that one who is a knower of Brahman is to be offered the post of Brahma in the sacrifice. So knowledge is subservient to sacrifice.

Madhva quotes some Kamaṭha śruti which is untraceable.

P.M. Modi concurs with Śaṅkara. He writes 'This refers to a śruti in which one who has studied the scripture is asked to perform the sacrifices e.g. the one quoted by Śaṅkara.[1]

The seventh sūtra is नियमाच्च। (3-4-7) And on account of prescribed rules. The sūtra refers to such śrutis which prescribe the rule. Īśa and Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa indicate that knowledge stands in a subordinate relation to work. Īśa reads कुर्वन्नेवेह कर्माणि जिजीविषेच्छतं समाः। एवं त्वयि नान्यथेतोऽस्ति न कर्म लिप्यते नरे। (Īśa-2) Performing work here, (in this life) let a man wish to live a hundred years thus work will not cling to, thee, man, there is no other way than that. Śatapatha reads एतद्वै जरामर्यं सत्रं यदग्निहोत्रं जरया वा ह्येवास्मान्मुच्यते मृत्युना वा। (xii-4-1-1) The Agnihotra is a satra upto

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, pp. 244-245

old age and death, for through old age one is freed from it through death.

Rāmānuja quotes from the Ī.U.

Śaṅkara is right in quoting from the Ī.U. as a v.v. of the sūtra.

The eighth sūtra is अधिकोपदेशात्तु बादरायणस्यैव तद्दर्शनात्। (3-4-8) But on account of the scriptural teaching that the Supreme Self is additional to the agent, Bādarāyaṇa's view is correct for that is seen in the scriptures. The Vedānta texts teach as the object of knowledge something different from the embodied self. They teach the Supreme free from all empirical attributes. Knowledge of the Supreme does not only not promote action, but cuts, all actions short. Śaṅkara quotes the śrutis यः सर्वज्ञः सर्ववित्। (M.U. 1-1-9) He who perceives all and knows all. भीषाऽस्माद्वातः पवते। (T.U. 2-8-1) From terror of it, the wind blows. महद्भयं वज्रमुद्यतम्। (Kaṭha U. 6-2) it is a great terror, a raised thunderbolt. तस्य वा अक्षरस्य प्रशासनं गार्गि। (B.U. 3-8-9) By the command of that Imperishable one, O Gārgi. तदैक्षत बहु स्यां प्रजायेयेति तत्तेजोऽसृजत। (C.U. 6-2-3) It thought, may I be many, may I grow forth. It sent forth fire. Thus it would be noticed that, Śaṅkara tries to emphasize the superiority of the Highest Self rather than the knowledge to Karma.

Rāmānuja agrees with Śaṅkara and quotes more or less the same śruti passages which Śaṅkara has quoted.

Vallabha also explains the sūtra in the similar wanner.

P.M. Modi explains the sūtra in this way. 'Bādarāyaṇa holds that the aim of human life is achieved from the knowledge of Brahman, because that knowledge is taught to be superior to the knowledge of action. This may refer to C.U. 7-4-1, M.U. 1-2-2 etc. and also to B.G. 4-33. P.M. Modi quotes from the M.U. some of them are as under:

प्लवाह्येते अदृढा यज्ञरूपा अष्टादशोक्तमवरं येषु कर्म।
एतच्छ्रेयो येऽभिनन्दन्ति मूढा जरामृत्युं ते पुनरेवापि यन्ति।। (M.U. 1-2-7)
अविद्यायां बहुधा वर्तमाना वयं कृतार्था इत्यभिमन्यन्ति बालाः।
यत्कर्मिणो न प्रवेदयन्ति रागात्तेनातुराः क्षीणलोकाश्च्यवन्ते।। (M.U. 1-2-9)
इष्टापूर्तं मन्यमाना वरिष्ठं नान्यच्छ्रेयो वेदयन्ते प्रमूढाः।
नाकस्य पृष्ठे ते सुकृतेऽनुभूत्वेमं लोकं हीनतरं विशन्ति।। and so on. (M.U. 1-2-10)

Unsteady, verily, are these boats of the eighteen sacrificial forms, which, are said to be inferior karma. The deluded who delight in this as leading to good, fall again into old age and death.

The immature living manifoldly in ignorance, think we have accomplished our aim. Since those who perform rituals do not understand (the truth) because of attachment, therefore they sink down, wretched, when their worlds (i.e. the fruits of their merits) are exhausted.

These deluded men, regarding sacrifices and works of merits as most important, do not know any other good. Having enjoyed in the high place of heaven won by good deeds, they enter again this world or a still lower one.

It may be submitted that, if the adhikaraṇa has begun with a view to establishing the superiority of knowledge, then, the v.v.s also should be such which go to prove, that knowledge is superior to action. Śaṅkara and following him, other commentators have tried to establish the superiority of Brahman and not the superiority of knowledge of Brahman, which, though, philosophically, ultimately comes to the same thing. From that point of view P.M. Modi's v.v.s are better. But still, his v.v.s which are the passages from the M.U. are leaning more on the side of proving the inferiority of action, rather than superiority of knowledge.

According to us ideal v.v. of this sūtra would be, such as मन्त्रविदेवास्मि, नात्मवित् (C.U. 7-1-3) I know only the words, not the self. Or द्वे विद्ये वेदितव्ये इति ह स्म यद्ब्रह्मविदो वदन्ति परा चैवापरा च।... अथ परा यया तदक्षरमधिगम्यते। (M.U. 1-1-4, 5) Two kin0ds of knowledge are to be known, as indeed, the knowers of Brahman declare- the higher as well as the lower.... And the higher is that by which the Undecaying is apprehended.

The ninth sūtra is तुल्यं तु दर्शनम्। (3-4-9) But the declarations of scripture support both views, These are passages which support that knowledge is incompatible, with work. एतद्ध स्म वै तद्विद्वांस: आहुर्ऋषय: कावषेया: किमर्था वयमध्येष्यामहे किमर्था वयं यक्ष्यामहे। एतद्ध स्म वै तत्पूर्वे विद्वांसोऽग्निहोत्रं न जुहवांचक्रिरे। (Kau. U. 2-5) Knowing this, the ṛṣis descended from Kāvaṣa said, 'For what purpose should we study the Veda? For what purpose should we sacrifice? Knowing

this indeed the ancient ones did not offer the Agnihotra.' (B.U. 3-5-2) When Brāhmaṇas know that self and have risen above the desire for sons, wealth, and worlds, they wander about as mendicants. एतावदरे खल्वमृतत्वमिति होक्त्वा याज्ञवल्क्य: प्रवव्राज। (B.U. 4-5-15) Thus far goes immortality. Having said so, Yājñavalkya went away into forest.

Rāmānuja explains the sūtra in the same way.

Śaṅkara has presented both, the views culling the passages from the śruti.

The next sūtra is असार्वत्रिकी। (3-4-10) (The declarations of the scripture referred to in sūtra 4) is non-comprehensive. The text यदेव विद्यया करोति (C.U. 1-1-10) Whatever a man does with knowledge does not refer to all knowledge but is connected only with Udgītha vidyā which is a topic of discussion in the section.

Other commentators follow Śaṅkara. The next sūtra is विभाग: शतवत्। (3-4-11) There is a division of knowledge and work as in the case of the hundred divided between two persons. तं विद्याकर्मणी समन्वारभेते। (B.U. 4-4-2) Then both his knowledge and his work take hold of him. Knowledge and work are to be taken in a distributive sense.

Rāmānuja's explanation is also similar to that of Śaṅkara.

Vallabha refers to a śruti which refers to the bliss which is hundredfold. स एको मानुष आनन्द:। ते ये शतं मानुषा आनन्दा:। स एको मनुष्यगन्धर्वाणामानन्द: I... स एक: प्रजापतेरानन्द:। श्रोत्रियस्य चाकामहतस्य। ते ये शतं प्रजापतेरानन्दा:। स एको ब्रह्मण आनन्द:। (T.U. 2-8-1)

That is one human bliss. What is a hundred times human bliss is the bliss of a gandharva among men. That is one bliss of Prajāpati, also of a man who is wellversed in the Vedas and who is not smitten with desire. What is a hundred times bliss of Prajāpati, that is one bliss of Brahma.

So according to Vallabha, T.U. passage is the v.v. of the sūtra.

P.M. Modi explains the sūtra in this way: 'This is an answer to sūtra 5 (स एको ब्रह्मण आनन्द:। समन्वारम्भणात्) seems to us to be the separation of 100 arteries from the one artery mentioned together in 'There are one hundred and one arteries in the heart.' etc. in the C.U. शतं चैका च हृदयस्य नाडयस्तासां मूर्धानमभिनि:सृतैका।

The विभाग of these arteries is made in that śruti itself. It is said there that of these hundred and one artery the one goes upwards towards the head, he who goes up thereby attains immortality, the other arteries are meant for various transmigrations in all directions. Just as the hundred arteries are here separated from the hundred and one mentioned together in the first quarter of the verse. Similarly कर्मन् is separated from विद्याकर्मणी in B.U. 4-4-2.

This is the view of the sūtrakāra in sūtra 11.[1] Apart from P.M. Modi's interpretation, his referring the word शतवत् to a C.U. passage and hundred arteries is totally without any basis and unwarranted. It can be taken only as an illustration of the mundane world, as Śaṅkara takes and not as P.M. Modi takes it, nor like Vallabha referring to the hundredfold bliss of the T.U. passage.

The next sūtra is अध्ययनमात्रवत: (3-4-12) The scriptures enjoin work on him who has merely read the Veda. Those who have read the Vedas and known about works are entitled to perform work. For those who have knowledge of the self from the Upaniṣads, no work is prescribed.

There need not be any v.v. for this sūtra.

The thirteenth sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is नाविशेषात्। (3-4-13) There being no special mention (the rule does) not (apply to him who knows). Sūtra 7 quotes Īśa-U. कुर्वन्नेवेह कर्माणि। This however is a general statement and does not specially mention the knower jñānī.

The previous-quoted v.v. continues to be discussed in this sūtra also.

The next sūtra is स्तुतयेऽनुमतिर्वा। (3-4-14) Or the permission is for the purpose of glorification of knowledge. The injunction to do work कुर्वन्नेवेह कर्माणि। (I.U.2) may be for the glorification of knowledge. A knower of the self may work all his life but on account of his knowledge he will not be bound by his work.

Rāmānuja and Vallabha explain the sūtra on the similar lines.

Madhva takes this sūtra as starting a fresh and lengthy adhikaraṇa (14-33). Madhva discusses the śruti साक्षादपरोक्षाद्ब्रह्म।... तस्माद्ब्राह्मण: पाण्डित्यं निर्विद्य बाल्येन तिष्ठासेत्। बाल्यं च पाण्डित्यं च निर्विद्याथ

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, pp. 247-248

मुनिः। अमौनं च मौनं च निर्विद्याथ मुनिः। अमौनं च मौनं च निर्विद्याथ ब्राह्मणः। स ब्राह्मणः केन स्याद्येन स्यात्तेनेदृश एव। (B.U. 3-5-1)

Brahman that is immediately present and directly perceived, Therefore let a Brāhmaṇa after he has done with learning desire to live as a child when he has done with a state of childhood, and with learning, then he becomes silent meditator. Having done with the non-meditative and the meditative states, then he becomes a Brāhmaṇa. How does the Brāhmaṇa behave? However he may behave, he is such indeed. Following right conduct is not without its effect on the aparokṣajñāna and his future. The words केन स्याद्येन स्याद् are no injunction or invitation to him to do as he may, including doing wrong and living an unmoral life. It is mere a statement intended to glorify aparokṣajñana and its possessor, sense of right and wrong. Thus according to Madhva, the first sūtra formulates an explanation of the śruti as glorificatory gesture or concession which can apply to different orders of adhikārins according to each one's disposition.

According to P.M. Modi, स्तुतये and अनुमति are two different conclusions. The Īśa śruti (2), according to him, is for praise of actions so that it shows that actions are more praiseworthy than renunciation of actions; therefore, one (even a knower of Brahman) should do them rather than renounce them.[1]

The next sūtra is कामकारेण चैके। (3-4-15) And some according to their choice (have refrained from all work). There is no obligation for the knowers of the self in regard to work. Some may choose to work in order to set an example to others while, others may abstain from work. Śaṅkara quotes from the B.U. एतद्ध स्म वै तत्पूर्वे विद्वांसः प्रजां न कामयन्ते किं प्रजया करिष्यामो येषां नोऽयमात्माऽयं लोकः। (B.U. 4-4-22) Knowing this the people of old did not wish for offspring. What shall we do with the offspring, they said, we who have this self and this world.

Rāmānuja follows Śaṅkara.

According to Vallabha, who explains the sūtra in two ways, in whatever way, the knower of Brahman, may do the work, he does not get related to the result of it.

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, p. 249

According to P.M. Modi, for a knower of Brahman, actions are not compulsory but voluntary. He quotes from the M.U.

आत्मक्रीडः आत्मरतिः क्रियावान् एष ब्रह्मविदां वरिष्ठः। (M.U. 3-1-4)

Sporting in the self, delighting in the self, performing works, such a one is the greatest of the knowers of Brahman.

Again

वेदान्तविज्ञानसुनिश्चितार्थाः संन्यासयोगाद्यतयः शुद्धसत्त्वाः।
ते ब्रह्मलोकेषु परान्तकाले परामृताः परिमुच्यन्ति सर्वे।। (M.U. 3-2-6)

The ascetics who have ascertained well the meaning of the Vedānta knowledge who have purified their natures through the path of renunciation, they dwelling in the worlds of Brahma, at the end of time, being one with the immortal are all liberated.[1]

Any śruti showing option in regard to work is possible. So, both: v.v. pointed out by Śaṅkara or the v.v. of P.M. Modi, are possible.

The next sūtra is उपमर्दं च। (3-4-16) And (scripture teaches) the destruction (of the qualification for works by knowledge). Knowledge destroys all ignorance with its distinctions of agent, act and result. As the B.U. says यत्र त्वस्य सर्वमात्मैवाभूत्तत्केन कं पश्येत्तत्केन कं जिघ्रेत। (B.U. 4-5-15) But when all has become the self of him, wherewith should he perceive another, wherewith should he smell another.

Rāmānuja is more specific in his v.v.

भिद्यते हृदयग्रन्थिश्छिद्यन्ते सर्वसंशयाः।
क्षीयन्ते चास्य कर्माणि तस्मिन्दृष्टे परावरे।। (M.U. 2-2-9)

The knot of the heart is cut, all doubts are dispelled, and his deeds terminate when He is seen-the higher and the lower.

Vallabha quotes the passage cited by Śaṅkara.

Madhva quotes some तुरश्रुति. The sūtra must be talking about the destruction of actions and hence, the v.v. quoted by Rāmānuja (M.U. 2-2-9) is more suited to the context.

The last sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is उध्वरेतःसु च शब्दे हि। (3-4-17) And (knowledge belongs) to those who observe chastity (i.e. Saṁnyāsin) because (this fourth stage of life is mentioned) in the scripture. To those in the stage of samnyāsa there is no work

---

1. Modi P.M., A Çritique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, p. 249

prescribed. ये चेमेऽरण्ये श्रद्धा तप इत्युपासते। (C.U. 5-10-1) Those in the forest practise faith and austerity. तपश्रद्धे ये ह्युपवसन्त्यरण्ये। (M.U. 1-2-11) Those who practise penance and faith in the forest. एतमेव प्रव्राजिनो लोकमिच्छन्तः प्रव्रजन्ति। (B.U. 4-4-22) Wishing for that world, only mendicants wander forth.

Rāmānuja's way of explaining the sūtra is similar.

Vallabha quotes from the M.U. संन्यासयोगाद्यतयः शुद्धसत्त्वाः। (M.U. 3-2-6)[1] On account the saṁnyāsa, mendicants have purified their beings.

V.V. pointed out by Śaṅkara seens to be the right one.

Parāmarśādhikaraṇam (3-4-18 to 20)

The adhikaraṇa has the following three sūtras

(i) परामर्शं जैमिनिरचोदना चापवदति हि। (3-4-18)

(ii) अनुष्ठेयं बादरायणः साम्यश्रुतेः। (3-4-19)

(iii) विधिर्वा धारणात्। (3-4-20)

The first sūtra is परामर्शं जैमिनिरचोदना चापवदति हि। (3-4-18) Jaimini (thinks that the passages mentioned in the previous sūtra contain) a reference (only to Saṁnyāsa) and not injunction for (other texts) condemn saṁnyāsa). In the C.U. passage त्रयो धर्मस्कन्धाः। (C.U. 2-23-1) there are three branches of law. We do not find words expressive of injunction. In the B.U. passage एतमेव प्रव्राजिनो लोकमिच्छन्तः प्रव्रजन्ति। (B.U. 4-4-22) Wishing for that world only, mendicants wander forth. This is a mere statement of the fact, and no injunction, The text promises steadfastness in Brahman. There are other texts which censure saṁnyāsa

आचार्याय प्रियं धनमाहृत्य प्रजातन्तुं मा व्यवच्छेत्सीः। (T.U. 1-11-1)

After having brought to thy teacher his proper reward, do not cut off the line of children.

Rāmānuja follows Śaṅkara.

According to Madhva, sūtras 14-17 offer one explanation of the words केन स्याद् येन स्याद् without accepting that they are mandatory. Sūtra 18 now offers a different explanation, from the point of view of their not being mandatory. The śruti kena syād

1. In the aṇubhāṣya with Pradīpa commentary ed. by Maganlal Shastri, this citation has been wrongly attributed to Mahānārayaṇa U. (also known as Nārāyaṇa U.), see p. 343

yena syād neither enjoins the jñānin to act without restriction or inhibitions in the matter of right and wrong nor have the words anything to do with the approving of indiscriminate conduct. Jaimini holds that there is no express injunction that the jñānin must defy the laws of conduct.

According to P.M. Modi, the sūtrakāra proceeds to prove that the knowledge of Brahman is not a simple reflection or thought but it is an object to be performed. According to P.M. Modi, the words अपवदति refers to such śrutis like (i) परीक्ष्य लोकान्कर्मचितान् ब्राह्मणो निर्वेदमायान्नास्त्यकृत: कृतेन। (M.U. 1-2-12), (ii) may be the whole of M.U. 1-2-1 to 10 in which rituals are deprecated,

न चक्षुषा गृह्यते नापि वाचा नान्यैदेवैस्तपसा कर्मणा वा।

ज्ञानप्रसादेन विशुद्धसत्त्वस्ततस्तु तं पश्यते निष्कलं ध्यायमान: ।। (M.U. 3-1-8)

Having scrutinised the worlds won by works, let a Brāhmaṇa arrive at non-attachment. The world that is not made is not won by what is done.

He is not grasped by the eye nor even by speech nor by other senseorgans, nor by austerity nor by work, but when one's nature is purified by the light of knowledge, then alone he, by meditation, sees Him who is without parts.

In these śrutis कर्मन् is denied to be a means of realising Brahman.[1]

According to P.M. Modi, it is not correct to see a reference to the āśramas in the sūtra as Śaṅkara has done. But, it is linked with the question of the knowledge being subservient to action and hence, it seems proper that now that question is taken up. And if this is the topic of discussion of this adhikaraṇa, then, the v.v.s pointed out by Śaṅkara are more appropriate.

The next sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is अनुष्ठेयं बादरायण: साम्यश्रुते: । (3-4-19) Bādarāyaṇa (thinks that saṁnyāsa) is to be accomplished, for the text (cited) applies equally (to all the four stages of life).

त्रयो धर्मस्कन्धा: । (C.U. 2-23-1) This text speaks of the first three āśramas of life. As the three stages of life are enjoined, similarly the last also should be taken as enjoined.

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, pp. 253-255

Rāmānuja's way of explaining the sūtra similar to that of Śaṅkara.

According to P.M. Modi, like Karman, Brahman-knowledge is also अनुष्ठेय. His reference to the śruti is द्वे विद्ये वेदितव्ये। (M.U. 1-1-4,5) This śruti passage implies the similarity of Brahmavidyā to karmavidyā.[1]

The next and last sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is विधिर्वा धारणवत्। (3-4-20) Or rather (there is) an injunction as in the case of, carrying (of the sacrificial fuel). Śaṅkara quotes from the Āpastamba Śrautasūtra अधस्तात्समिधं धारयन्नूद्वेदुपरि हि देवेभ्यो धारयति। (IX-11-8-9) Let him approach carrying the firewood below (the ladle holding the offering) for above he carries it for the gods. The last clause is interpreted as an injunction by Jaimini though it is not in the form of an injunction. On account of its newness (a-pūrvatā) it is an injunction. In accordance with this view त्रयो धर्मस्कन्धाः। (C.U. 2-23-1) is an injunction and not a mere reference. There are other texts which directly enjoin saṁnyāsa. ब्रह्मचर्यं परिसमाप्य गृही भवेद्गृही भूत्वा वनी भवेद्वनी भूत्वा प्रव्रजेत्। यदि वेतरथा ब्रह्मचर्यादेव प्रव्रजेद्गृहाद्वा वनाद्वा। (J.U. 4) Having completed his studentship he is to become a householder, having been a householder, he is to become an inhabitant of the forest, having been an inhabitant in the forest, he is to wander forth, or else, he may wander forth from the student's state or from the house or from the forest.

Rāmānuja's citations and interpretation are similar to that of Śaṅkara. However, his first adhikaraṇa of the present pāda (fourth pāda) ends here.

Vallabha explains the sūtra taking an analogy from the Yogaśāstra. As in Yogaśāstra, the meditation of a mental image is a means to contemplation, similarly there is an injunction for karman as a means to Bhakti.

Madhva continues the discussion of the śruti kena syād... in this sūtra.

P.M. Modi, continues to discuss the forms of knowledge of Brahman. Jaimini had said that the knowledge of Brahman is not of the form of a विधि. Now Bādarāyaṇa says that it is a विधि. P.M.

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, p. 255

Modi refers to such śrutis which are विधि.[1] आत्मा वाअरे द्रष्टव्यः श्रोतव्यो मन्तव्यो निदिध्यासितत्यः। (B.U. 2-4-5)

Stutimātrādhikaraṇam (3-4-21, 22)

The adhikaraṇa has the following two sūtras:

(i) स्तुतिमात्रमुपादानादिति चेन्नापूर्वत्वात्। (3-4-21)

(ii) भावशब्दाच्च। (3-4-22)

The first sūtra is स्तुतिमात्रमुपादानादिति चेन्नापूर्वत्वात्। (3-4-21) If it be said that (the texts such as the one about the udgītha are) mere glorification, on account of their reference (to parts of sacrifices) (we say that it is) not so, on account of the newness (of what they teach). The passages under discussion are from the C.U. स एष रसानां रसतमः परमः पराध्योऽष्टमो यदुद्गीथः। (C.U. 1-1-3) The Udgītha is the best of all essences, the highest holding the highest place, the eighth. इयमेवग्निः साम। (C.U. 1-6-1) The earth is the R.K., the fire is Saman,

The pūrvapakṣa says that these passages simply glorify the ladle, and so on. The sūtra refutes the view and states that glorification to have a purpose, must be in complementary relation to an injunction. The passage is a part of the Upaniṣad and cannot be taken along with the injunctions, about the Udgītha in the ritual part. Hence, on account of its being novel, it is an injunction and not mere glorification.

Rāmānuja also refers to the same passages quoted by Śaṅkara.

Vallabha explains the sūtra as follows. If it be said that the knowers of Brahman too admit of Karman, as there is just praise of knowledge in the śruti. एष नित्यो महिमा ब्राह्मणस्य। (B.U. 4-4-23) This is the eternal glory of Brahman, we say no. The jñānin does not enter, into any relation with karma or its fruit. Śruti passage also points out the non-relation between jñānin and the fruit of karma.

As stated earlier, for P.M. Modi, आत्मा वा अरे द्रष्टव्यः...etc. is a विधि because that विधि is not to be found elsewhere. So it is अपूर्व.[2]

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, p. 256
2. Ibid, pp. 256-257

The next sūtra is भावशब्दाच्च। (3-4-22) And on account of texts expressive of injunction. (C.U. 1-1-1) Let him meditate on the Udgītha. उद्गीथमुपासीत। (C.U. 2-2-1) Let him meditate on the sāman.

Now these injunctive forms would be rendered futile by the assumption of the texts under discussion aiming at glorification only,

Rāmānuja explains the sūtra in the same way as Śaṅkara.

This sūtra is not found and commented upon in Aṇubhāṣya.

Madhva quotes from some चतुरश्रुति. According to P.M. Modi the sūtra refers to such śrutis as आत्मेत्येव उपासीत। (B.U. 1-4-7), स क्रतुं कुर्वीत। (C.U. 3-14-1) etc. But, if, P.M. Modi expostulates, भावशब्द means the word of the existence of Brahman or the Supreme Being, which would prove that śrutis about it are not glorification of the individual soul, but really express a reality existing principle, then the word refers to such texts as सदेव सोम्येदमग्र आसीदेकमेवाद्वितीयम्। (C.U. 6-2-1) अस्तीत्येवोपलब्धव्यः। (Kaṭha U. 6-3) असन्नेव स भवति असद्ब्रह्मेति वेद चेत् (T.U. 2-6). If Brahman really exists, the texts about Brahman are not स्तुति or glorification but they describe the really existing Brahman.'[1]

Pāriplavādhikaraṇam (3-4-23, 24) The adhikaraṇa has the following two sūtras viz.

(i) पारिप्लवार्था इति चेन्न विशेषितत्वात्। (3-4-23)

(ii) तथा चैकवाक्यतोपबन्धात्। (3-4-24)

The first sūtra is पारिप्लवार्था इति चेन्न विशेषितत्वात्। (3-4-23) If it be said (that the stories in the Upaniṣads are) for the purpose of pāriplavas (we say it is) not so, because (only certain stories) are specified for the purpose.

A doubt is raised as to whether the stories such as of Yājñavalkya and his two wives, (B.U. 4-5-1) or of Pratardana (Kau. U. 3-1) or of Jānaśruti (C.U. 4-1-1) recited at the intervals of the sacrifices form part of the ritualistic acts as the recital of certain stories take place at the intervals of a horse sacrifice. The sūtra denies that they serve this purpose. The stories meant for this purpose are specified while the Upaniṣadic stories are not specified for this purpose.

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, pp. 257-258

Rāmānuja and Vallabha explain the sūtra on similar lines.

Madhva continues the discussion of the केन स्याद्, येन स्याद् passage.

Śaṅkara seems to be correct in explaining that the episodes of the Upaniṣads are not meant to be used in the pāriplava rite. So there can be as many episodes - ākhyāyikās as there are in the Upaniṣadic literature, which can be the topics of reference of the sūtra.

The next sūtra is तथा चैकवाक्यतोपबन्धात्। (3-4-24). This follows also from the connection (of the stories with the meditations) in one whole. The storyform is used to make the message attractive and easy to follow. Stories are intended to introduce the meditations.

Rāmānuja explains the sūtra on similar lines.

Vallabha explains that even the episodes have the knowledge as the main theme.

Madhva continues the discussion of the threefold adhikārabheda.

According to P.M. Modi, the sūtrakāra seems to hold the view that कर्मकाण्ड and ज्ञानकाण्ड both are established by different विधि. [1]

Agnīndhanādyadhikaraṇam (3-4-25)

This is a one-sūtra-adhikaraṇa. The sūtra is अत एव चाग्नीन्धनाद्यनपेक्षा। (3-4-5) And for this very reason, there is no need of the lighting of the fire and so on. As the goal is achieved through knowledge, the lighting of the sacrificial fire etc. are not necessary.

Rāmānuja explains that the persons in the fourth stage of life observing celibacy do not require the sacrificial fire, fuel etc.

Vallabha quotes from the Mahānārāyaṇa U.

तस्यैवं विदुषो यज्ञस्यात्मा यजमानः श्रद्धा पत्नी शरीरमिध्ममुरो वेदिर्लोमानि बहिर्वेदः शिखा हृदयं यूपः काम आज्यं मन्युः पशुस्तपो अग्निः।[2]

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, pp. 258-259
2. Also called Nārāyaṇa U., see, one Hundred and twelve Upaniṣads and their Philosophy by Dr. A.N. Bhattacharya, p. 149.

For him the knower, in the sacrifice, the host is self, spouse is faith, body is sacrificial fuel, bosom is the altar, hair are the sacrificial seat, knowledge is flame, heart is a sacrificial post, desire is the ghee, anger is the animal and penance is fire.

Vallabha explains the sūtra by stating that though knowledge itself is not the material for karma, it can raise the material for karma by its own power.

According to P.M. Modi, the एकवाक्यता of the आत्मज्ञान and कर्मज्ञान is established by each of them independently, by virtue of independent विधि. Therefore, कर्मज्ञान requires fuel, fire etc. but आत्मज्ञान does not need those things. [1]

Sarvapekṣādhikaraṇam (3-4-26, 27)

The adhikaraṇa has two sūtras:

(i) सर्वापेक्षा च यज्ञादिश्रुतेरश्ववत्। (3-4-26)

(ii) शमदमाद्युपेतः स्यात्तथापि तु तद्विधेस्तदङ्गतया तेषामवश्यानुष्ठेयत्वात्। (3-4-27) सर्वापेक्षा च यज्ञादिश्रुतेरश्ववत्। (3-4-26) And there is a need of all (works) on account of the scriptural statement of sacrifices and the like, as in the case of the horse. The sūtra says that works are useful as a means to knowledge and even the scriptures prescribe them. But they have no share in producing the result of knowledge which is liberation. Liberation results from knowledge and not from work. Work purifies the mind and the knowledge of the self is manifested in a pure mind. तमेतं वेदानुवचनेन ब्राह्मणा विविदिषन्ति यज्ञेन दानेन तपसाऽनाशकेन। (B.U. 4-4-22) Him Brāhmaṇas seek to know by the study of the Veda, by sacrifice, by gifts, by penance, by fasting. अथ यद्यज्ञ इत्याचक्षते ब्रह्मचर्यमेव तत्। (C.U. 8-5-1) What people call sacrifice that is really Brahmacarya. So the rituals are a means to knowledge. It is like a sacrificial horse. As the horse owing to its specific suitability is not employed for dragging ploughs, but is harnessed to chariots, so the works enjoined on the āśramas are not required by knowledge for bringing about its results but with a view to its origination of knowledge.

Rāmānuja also quotes the B.U. cited by Śaṅkara.

Vallabha would explain the sūtra in this way. As there is some use of a horse to reach a particular place, similarly

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, p. 260

everything including jñāna, karma and bhakti is useful in order to attain mokṣa. From this point of view, śruti also describes Yajña.

Madhva concurs with Śaṅkara as far as the v.v. (B.U. 4-4-22) is concerned.

P.M. Modi, also expresses his agreement to the v.v. quoted by Śaṅkara.

Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja take the word अश्ववत् in the sūtra indicating illustration. But, perhaps, P.M. Modi may be right in referring अश्ववत् to the allegorical sacrifice described in the B.U, 1-1-1, 2.'[1]

The next sūtra is शमदमाद्युपेतः स्यात्तथापि तु तद्विधेस्तदङ्गतया तेषामवश्यानुष्ठेयत्वात्। (3-4-27) (3-4-27)

But ever if it be so (there is no injunction to do work to attain knowledge in B.U. 4-4-22) one must possess calmness, self-control and the like, since, they are enjoined as help to knowledge and (on that account) have necessarily to be accomplished.

The sūtra has a reference to the B.U. passage:

तस्मादेवंविच्छान्तो दान्त उपरतस्तितिक्षुः समाहितो भूत्वात्मन्येवमात्मानं पश्यन्ति। (B.U. 4-4-23)

He who knows it as such having become calm, self controlled, withdrawn, patient and collected sees the self in his own self. This is injunctive in character. These qualities are enjoined and hence to be accomplished. Self-control etc. directly help it indirectly.

B.U. passage quoted by Śaṅkara is the v.v. of the sūtra without any doubt.

Sarvānnānumatyadhikaraṇam (3-4-28 to 31)

The adhikaraṇa has the following four sūtras:

(i) सर्वान्नानुमतिश्च प्राणात्यये तद्दर्शनात्। (3-4-28)

(ii) अबाधाच्च। (3-4-29)

(iii) अपि च स्मर्यते। (3-4-30)

(iv) शब्दश्चातो कामकारे। (3-4-31)

The first sūtra is सर्वान्नानुमतिश्च प्राणात्यये तद्दर्शनात्। (3-4-28) Only in case of danger to life, there is permission to take all types of

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, pp. 261-262

food; because the scripture shows that. In the C.U. it is stated न ह वा एवंविदि किंचनानन्नं भवति। (C.U. 5-2-1) For one who knows this, there is nothing whatever, that is not food. In the B.U. also, it is stated न ह वा अस्यान्नं खाद्यं भवति नानन्नं प्रतिगृहीतम्। (B.U. 6-1-14) By him, nothing is eaten that is not food, nothing is received that is not food. The pūrvapakṣa argues that it is an injunction since it is not found anywhere else.

The sūtra refutes the view and holds that it is only a statement of fact. Forbidden food can be taken only when there is danger to life, as was done by the sage Cākrāyaṇa when his life was in danger.

Rāmānuja, Madhva and Vallabha explain the sūtra in the same manner as Śaṅkara.

P.M. Modi agrees to the v.v. pointed out by Śaṅkara though he has a different way of interpretation.[1]

The next sūtra is अबाधाच्च। (3-4-29) And because of non-contradiction. In the C.U. it is stated आहारशुद्धौ सत्त्वशुद्धिः। (C.U. 7-26-2) When the food is pure, the mind is pure. Such statements remain uncontradicted.

Rāmānuja, Madhva and Vallabha follow the same line of interpretation as Śaṅkara. According to P.M. Modi, Śaṅkara has not been able to point out any v.v. in this sūtra.

But this contention of P.M. Modi does not seem to be correct. P.M. Modi should know that Śaṅkara does refer to a śruti though not actually quoted ad verbatim, by stating आहारशुद्धौ सत्त्वशुद्धिः। These words unmistakably refer to the C.U. passage (7-26-2)[2]

The third sūtra is अपि च स्मर्यते। (3-4-30) Moreover, the smṛtis say so. Manusmṛti says

जीवितात्ययमापन्नो योऽन्नमत्ति यतस्ततः।
लिप्यते न स पापेन पद्मपत्रमिवाम्भसा॥ (Manusmṛti X - 104)

He who being in danger of his life eats from anywhere is stained by in no more than the lotus-leaf by water.

Rāmānuja also quotes the same passages. Madhva quotes from the Harivaṁśa.

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, pp. 268-269
2. Ibid, p. 269

अतीतानागतज्ञानी त्रैलोक्योद्धरणक्षमः।
एतादृशोऽपि नाचारं श्रौतं स्मार्तं परित्यजेत्॥

Even the wisest of men who knows the past and can foretell the future and is able to save the three worlds shall not give up the performance of duties laid down in the śrutis and smṛtis.

Vallabha follows the same line of explanation as that of Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja.

The smṛti referred to by Śaṅkara is quite appropriate and more specific than the passage cited by Madhva which is of a wider application.

The last sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is शब्दश्चातो कामकारे। (3-4-31) And hence also a scriptural passage as to non-acting according to one's own desire.

There are scriptural passages prohibiting one from acting as one pleases. Unrestrained freedom cannot help us to attain knowledge. Śaṅkara quotes Kāṭhaka Saṁhitā तस्माद्वा ब्राह्मणः सुरां न पिबेत् Therefore a Brāhmaṇa should not take liquor. Rāmānuja also quotes the same passage cited by Śaṅkara.

Madhva quotes some Kauṇḍinya śruti. Vallabha quotes from the B.U. which has already been quoted by Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja in the sūtra 3-4-27 (शमदमाद्युपेतः...)

P.M. Modi's reference to the C.U. is perhaps better suited to the context. He refers to the words in the Uṣasti Cākrāyaṇa ākhyāyikā wherein, Uṣasti does not drink water from that from which the rich man has drunk. He says कामो मे उदपानम् 11-10-4) So we may say that the eating was against his wish (अकामकारे) or we may also interpret, drinking water would be the fulfillment of my wanton wish (कामः) and that I wouldn't do,[1]

Āśramakarmādhikaraṇam (3-4-32 to 35)

The adhikaraṇa has the following four sūtras:

(i) विहितत्वाच्चाश्रमकर्मापि। (3-4-32)

(ii) सहकारित्वेन। (3-4-33)

(iii) सर्वथापि त एवोभयलिङ्गात्। (3-4-34)

(iv) अनभिभवं च दर्शयति। (3-4-55)

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, pp. 270-271

The first sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is विहितत्वाच्चाश्रमकर्मापि। (3-4-32) And the duties of the āśramas are (incumbent on him) also (who does not desire release) because they are enjoined (on him by the scriptures).

If works are a means to knowledge, then the question is, whether works are necessary for the one who does not wish to attain knowledge. The sūtra answers that these duties of the stages of life are obligatory for all, as it is laid down यावज्जीवमग्निहोत्रं जुहोति। (Āpastamba śrauta sūtra 3-14-11)

Rāmānuja quoting the same passage explains the sūtra in a similar way. Vallabha also follows.

Madhva's arrangement of the sūtra is different but, his explanation runs on parralled lines.

P.M. Modi's explanation of the word विहित that it means laid down in the Upaniṣads for a seeker of Brahman.'[1] does not seem to be the correct one. Why only in the Upaniṣads? The words विहित, विधि etc. are more connected with the literature other than the Upaniṣads, and hence, it was appropriate to go in search for a passage from the non-Upaniṣadic literature.

The next sūtra is सहकारित्वेन च। (3-4-33) Also, because of being helpful (as a means of knowledge). Duties help in producing knowledge, though not its fruit, emancipation which is attained only through knowledge. Śaṅkara quotes तमेतं वेदानुवचनेन ब्राह्मणा विविदर्षान्त। (B.U. 4-4-22) to point out the aids.

Rāmānuja says that works give rise to the desire for knowledge.

According to Madhva, the sūtra shows how the observance of karma and right conduct are auxiliary to Jñāna.

Vallabha explains on similar lines.

The next sūtra is सर्वथापि त एवोभयलिङ्गात्। (3-4-34) In all cases the same duties (have to be performed) on account of the twofold indicatory mark. The question is raised whether the works done as enjoined in the stages of life or those performed as aids to knowledge are of two different kinds. The answer is in either case the same duties are performed as is seen from the śruti and smṛti texts. तमेतं वेदानुवचनेन ब्राह्मणा विविदषन्ति। (B.U. 4-4-22)

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, pp. 271-272

Him the Brāhmaṇas seek to know through the study of the Veda. Smṛti text is अनाश्रित: कर्मफलं कार्यं कर्म करोति य: । (B.G. 6-1). He who performs the work to be done without aiming at the fruit of the work.

Madhva refers to the story of Indra and Virocana which proves both the rule and the exception, that only those who are intrinsically fit attain mokṣa and those who are not fit do not.

Vallabha explains the sūtra from the bhakti point view. According to him, works to be performed in the path of devotion should be given preference to the works in the path of knowledge, if it is not possible to perform both. Vallabha quotes B.U.

तमेव धीरो विज्ञाय प्रज्ञां कुर्वीत ब्राह्मण: ।

नानुध्यायाद् बहून् शब्दान् वाचो विग्लापनं हि तत्।। (B.U. 4-4-21)

Let a wise after knowing him alone, practise wisdom. Let him not reflect on many words for that is mere weariness of speech.

The last sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is अनभिभवं च दर्शयति। (3-4-35) And scripture declares that (those performing works) are not overpowered (by passion and the likes). Scripture shows that he who is equipped with self-control etc. is not overpowered by such afflictions as passion and the like. C.U. states एष ह्यात्मा न नश्यति यं ब्रह्मचर्येणानुविन्दते। (C.U. 8-5-3) That self does not perish which they find out by Brahmacarya.

Rāmānuja quotes from the Mahanārāyaṇa U. धर्मेण पापमवनुदति। (Mahānārāyaṇa U. 22-1) With the merit, sins get destroyed. Thus the knowledge is not overpowered.

According to Madhva, the natural and intrinsic fitness cannot be overcome. Vallabha states that the qualities of the lord are not in any way overpowered, thus shows śruti. सर्वं पाप्मानं तरति नैनं पाप्मा तरति। सर्वं पाप्मानं तपति नैनं पाप्मा तपति। (B.U. 4-4-23) Sin does not overcome him, he overcomes all sins. Sin does not burn him, he burns all evils.

Vidhurādhikaraṇam (3-4-36 to 39) The adhikaraṇa has the following four sūtras:

(i) अन्तरा चापि तु तद्दृष्टे: । (3-4-36)

(ii) अपि च स्मर्यते। (3-4-37)

(iii) विशेषानुग्रहश्च। (3-4-38)

(iv) अतस्त्वितरज्ज्यायो लिङ्गाच्च। (3-4-39)

The first sūtra is अन्तरा चापि तु तद्दृष्टेः। (3-4-36) But also (persons standing) between (are qualified for knowledge) for that is seen (in scriptures). The sūtra states that, persons who do not belong to any recognised state of life are also fit for Brahma-knowledge. Śaṅkara gives the instances of Raikva and Vācaknavī.

Rāmānuja follows Śaṅkara. According to Vallabha, the works of the stages of life are a hindrance to the person who has visualised the Lord.

P.M. Modi has a doubt regarding Raikva and Vācaknavi whether they avoided आश्रमकर्मन् at all. According to him, the sūtra has a reference to a śruti in which the suppression of the duties of some of the orders of life is mentioned. एतद्ध स्म वै तत्पूर्वे विद्वांसः प्रजां न कामयन्ते किं प्रजया करिष्यामो येषां नोऽयमात्मा यं लोक इति, ते ह स्म पुत्रैषणायाश्च वित्तैषणायाश्च लोकैषणायाश्च व्युत्थाय भिक्षाचर्यं चरन्ति। (B.U. 4-4-22)

Verily, because they know this, the ancient (sages) did not wish for offspring. What shall we do with offspring, we who have attained this Self, this world. They, having risen above the desire for sons, the desire for wealth, the desire for worlds, led the life of a mendicant.[1]

In fact, Śaṅkara's explaining the sūtra has the advantage of including all members of the society and non-members of the society, those who are on the periphery of the society also like Raikvạ. From the description, it appears that, Raikva, until he met the king Jānaśruti, did not belong to any order of life i.e. āśrama.

The next sūtra is अपि च स्मर्यते। (3-4-37) Also this is stated in the smṛti. Saṁvarta and others paid no regard to the duties incumbent on the stages of life and yet attained the highest-knowledge.

Rāmānuja explains that men who do not belong to an āśrama or a stage of life may grow in knowledge through prayer and the like. He quotes Manusmṛti

जापेनापि स संसिध्येद्ब्राह्मणो नात्र संशयः।
कुर्यादन्यन्न वकुर्यान्मैत्रो ब्राह्मण उच्यते।। (Manusmṛti 2-87)

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, pp. 277-278

Even by chanting a brāhmaṇa attains knowledge there is no doubt about it. Whether he does anything else or not, Maitra is called a Brāhmaṇa.

P.M. Modi refers to a smṛti text सर्वधर्मान्परित्यज्य मामेकं शरणं व्रज। (B.G. 18-66) Abandoning all other duties, seek my refuge only.[1]

The next sūtra is विशेषानुग्रहश्च (3-4-38) And special works favour (knowledge). Those who are not householders or are unable due to poverty etc. to perform the duties of the stages of life can attain knowledge through special works like prayer, fasting meditation etc. which are not opposed to the condition of those, who do not belong to any stage of life. Śaṅkara quotes the Manusmṛti 2-87.

Rāmānuja quotes from the P.U. तपसा ब्रह्मचर्येण श्रद्धया विद्ययात्मानमन्विष्येत्। (P.U. 1-10) He should seek self with penance, celibacy, faith and knowledge.

The last sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is अतस्त्वितरज्ज्यायो लिङ्गाच्च। (3-4-39) But better in Rāmānuja and Madhva this sūtra is not found.

Vallabha states that this has been stated in the śruti. He quotes from the गोपालपूर्वतापिन्युपनिषद् : भक्तिरस्य भजनम्। तद् इहामुत्रोपाधिनैराश्येनामुष्मिन्मनःकल्पनम्। एतदेव च नैषकर्म्यम्।

Devotion means singing of his praise, without aiming at a fruit either here or there, and concentrating upon him only, and this is the only actionless state.

P.M. Modi quotes the C.U. in which the word आर्त्विज्यम् occurs. स होवाच भगवन्तं वा अहमेभिः सर्वैः आर्त्विज्यैः पर्यैषिषं भगवतो वा अहमवित्त्यान्यानवृषि। भगवांस्त्वेव मे सर्वैरार्त्विज्यैरिति तथेत्यथतर्ह्येत एव समतिसृष्टाः स्तुवतां यावत्त्वेभ्यो धनं दद्यास्तावन्मम दद्या इति तथेति ह यजमान उवाच। (C.U. 1,11-2,3) Then he said, 'I looked for you for all these priestly offices. Verily, not finding you, sir, I have chosen others. But now, sir, please take up all the priestly offices. 'So be it,' he said, 'Let these with my permission sing the praises. But as much wealth as you give to them, so much give to me also.' The institutor of the sacrifice said, 'So be it.'

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, p. 278

Also तस्मादार्त्विज्यं करिष्यन् वाचि स्वरमिच्छेत् तया वाचा स्वरसम्पन्नयार्त्विज्यं कुर्यात्तस्माद्यज्ञे स्वरवन्तं दिदृक्षन्ते। (B.U. 1-3-25)

Therefore, one who is about to perform the duties of a ṛtvij priest desires to have than this is the other (stage or belonging to an āśrama) on account of the indicatory marks.

Though it is possible for one who stands between two, āśramas to attain knowledge both the śruti and smṛti say that it is better to belong to some āśramas. B.U. says तेनैति ब्रह्मवित्पुण्यकृत्तैजसश्च। (B.U. 4-4-9) On that path goes whoever knows Brahman and who has done holy works and obtained splendour. The smṛti also says

अनाश्रमी न तिष्ठेत दिनमेकमपि द्विजः।
संवत्सरमनाश्रमी स्थित्वा कृच्छ्रमेकं चरेत्॥

Let a Brāhmaṇa stay not one day even outside the āśrama. Having stayed outside for a year, he goes to utter ruin.

According to Vallabha, bhaktimārga is superior to jñānamārga.

According to P.M. Modi, the sūtrakāra seems to have a verse कर्म ज्यायोह्यकर्मणः। (B.G. 3-8) of the B.G. Action is better than inaction.[1]

Tadbhūtādhikaraṇam (3-4-40) This is a one-sūtra adhikaraṇa. The sūtra is

तद्भूतस्य तु नातद्भावो जैमिनेरपि नियमातद्रूपाभावेभ्यः। (3-4-40) But of him, who has become that (entered on a higher āśrama) there is no becoming not that (i.e. reverting to a lower one), according to Jaimini also, on account of the rule and absence of the forms of that.

The question is whether one who has taken to Saṁnyāsa can revert to the previous stages of life. The sūtra states that he cannot for the texts do not speak of reversion. There is only ascent to the next stages of life. There is no going back.

Rāmānuja explains the sūtra in the same way quoting from the C.U. ब्रह्मचर्याचार्यकुलवासी तृतीयोऽत्यन्तमात्मानमाचार्यकुलेऽवसादयन्। (C.U. 2-23-1) Dwelling in the house of the teacher, the third is absolutely controlling his body in the house of the teacher.

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, p. 280

Madhva interprets that asuras cannot become gods and gods cannot become asuras and it is the same with men. This is acceptable to Jaimini also.

Vallabha explains the sūtra as saying that once a devotee obtains the Bhagavadbhāva, then, he retains it forever and does not revert to the old state.

P.M. Modi explains the sūtra in the same way as that of Śaṅkara, though he suggests an adhikaraṇa of the three sūtras with this.

Adhikārādhikaraṇam (3-4-41-42)

The adhikaraṇa has the two sūtras:

(i) न चाधिकारिकमपि पतनानुमानात्तदयोगात्। (3-4-41)

(ii) उपपूर्वमपि त्वेके भावमशनवत्तदुक्तम्। (3-4-42)

The first sūtra is न चाधिकारिकमपि पतनानुमानात्तदयोगात्। (3-4-41) And not also (can the expiation take place) mentioned in the chapter treating of qualifications because a lapse is inferred (in his case from the smṛti) and because of its inefficiency (in his case).

If a celebate for life breaks from inattention the vow of celibacy, is he to perform the expiatory sacrifice mentioned in the text Āpastamba Dharmasūtra (1-9-26-89) The pūrvapakṣa maintains that such sins cannot be expiated.

Rāmānuja interprets the sūtra on the similar lines.

According to Madhva, anyone who is ambitious beyond his deserts to attain the position of ādhikārikas or ṛsis to which he is not eligible is doomed to fall.

According to Vallabha, the Lord does not grant any ruling power or luxury resulting from it, because that would be a fall and for the person, who has attained भगवद्भाव it is not possible also.

Various contingencies arising in the orders of life are discussed in this adhikaraṇa on the basis of the mīmāṁsā and so need not have any v.v.

According to P.M. Modi, the sūtra states that one who has become a monk cannot perform even the official duties.[1]

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, pp. 283-284

The second sūtra is उपपूर्वमपि त्वेके भावमशनवत्तदुक्तम्। (3-4-42) But some (consider the lapse) a minor one (and claims) the existence (of expiation for naisṭhika brahmacārins also). This has been stated (in the Pūrvamīmāṁsā).

The sūtra continues the discussion based on the Pūrvamīmāṁsā. P.M. Modi takes the preposition उप as referring to the C.U. passage तत्रोद्गादतृं आस्तावे स्तोष्यमाणान् उपोपविवेश स ह प्रस्तोतारमुवाच। (C.U. 1-10-8) Then he sat down near the Udgātṛ priests as they were about to sing the hymn in the place (assigned) for singing. Then he said to the Prastotṛ Priest. P.M. Modi explains the sūtra in this way. उषस्ति चाक्रायण did not actually act as a priest in the sacrifice of the rich lord, but he only supervised over the other priests that were actually officiating there, so this kind of professional duty may be allowed in the case of a monk (तद्भूत) under the conditions by अशनवत्. That is in the dire circumtances, उषस्ति चाक्रायण had to eat impure beans. Now this explanation by P.M. Modi appears to be farfetched. For, Uṣasti Cākrāyaṇa was not a monk. He was a householder, and must be performing such priestly duties as is evident from the remark by the host स होवाच भगवन्तं वा अहमेभिः सर्वैरार्त्विज्यैः पर्यैषिषं भगवतो वा अहमवित्यान्यानवृषि। C.U. 1-11-2. Then he said, 'I looked for you for all these priestly offices verily, not finding you, sir, I have chosen others.' Only thing is Uṣasti Cākrāyaṇa lived in an area, which was affected by hailstorms. So, the illustration of Uṣasti Cākrāyaṇa does not appear to be a paralled and hence his (P.M. Modi's)[1] interpretation is not convincing and not borne out by the text. This much for keeping out v.v.

Bahiradhikaraṇam (3-4-43)

This is a one-sūtra adhikaraṇa. The sūtra is बहिस्तूभयथापि स्मृतेराचाराच्च (3-4-43) But in both cases, they are kept to be outside society on account of smṛti and custom. Whether the lapses are to be considered major or minor ones, good people avoid such transgressors, since smṛti and approved custom both condemn them.

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, pp. 290-291

Rāmānuja explains the sūtra in the same way.

The sūtra continues the various contingencies arising at the various stages of life, and hence, as previously remarked, need not have any v.v.

Svāmyadhikaraṇam (3-4-44 to 46) The adhikaraṇa has the following three sūtras:

(i) स्वामिन: फलश्रुतेरित्यात्रेय:। (3-4-44)

(ii) आर्त्विज्यमित्यौडुलोमिस्तस्मै हि परिक्रीयते। (3-4-45)

(iii) श्रुतेश्च। (3-4-46)

The first sūtra is स्वामिन: फलश्रुतेरित्यात्रेय: (3-4-44) To the Lord of the sacrifice only, the agentship in meditation belongs because scripture declares a fruit (for it); thus Ātreya thinks.

The question is raised as to the agentship of the meditations connected with members of sacrificial acts. Is the sacrificer or the priest the agent? Ātreya holds that the agentship belongs to the sacrificer since the śruti declares a special fruit for these meditations. C.U. says वर्षति हास्मै वर्षयति ह य एतदेवं विद्वान्वृष्टौ पञ्चविधं सामोपास्ते। (C.U. 2-3-2)

There is rain for him, and he brings rain for others, who thus knowing meditates on the fivefold Sāman as rain. This is the opinion of Ātreya.

Rāmānuja explains the sūtra in the similar fashion. According to Madhva, Ātreya opines that the fruits of jñāna must belong to the Tattvābhimāni Devatās or Gods. Madhva quotes Mādhyandināyana Śruti.

यदु किं चेमा: प्रजा: शुभमाचरन्ति देवा एव तदाचरन्ति यदु किं चेमा: प्रजा विजानते देवा एव तद्विजानते देवानां ह्येतत् भवति, स्वामी हि फलमश्नुते नास्वामी कर्म कुर्वाण:।

Whatever good, men do, the gods alone do it whatever the men understand that the gods alone understand in full. All this belongs to the gods. For only the master enjoys the fruits of work done-not he who is not the master but does the mere toil.

Vallabha refers to his grace theory quoting यमेवैष वृणुते तेन लभ्य:। The self is obtained by the one whom he chooses.

P.M. Modi refers to the C.U. passages

तेन तं ह बको दाल्भ्यो विदांचकार। स ह नैमिषीयानामुद्गाता बभूव स ह स्मैभ्यः कामानागायति। आगाता ह वै कामानां भवति य एतदेवं विद्वानक्षरमुद्गीथमुपासते इत्यध्यात्मम्। (C.U. 1-2-13, 14) (C.U. 1-7-8, 9)[1]

Baka Dālbhya knew it. He became the Udgātṛ priest of the people of Naimiṣa. He sang out for them their desires. He obtains wishes by singing, who knowing this, thus, meditates on the Udgītha as the syllable. This is with regard to the Self.

Therefore, an udgātṛ priest, who knows this should say (the following). What desire may I win for you singing? He truly becomes capable of obtaining desire by singing, he, who knowing this sings the Sāman, yea, sings the Sāman.

Śruti pointed out by P.M. Modi seems to be more pertinent.

The next sūtra is आर्त्विज्यमित्यौडुलोमिस्तस्मै हि परिक्रीयते। (3-4-45) (They are) the work of the priest, this is the view of Auḍulomi since that he is paid.

The meditations have to be observed by the priest, since he is paid for his acts. The fruits of his acts are purchased by the sacrificer. This is the view of the sage Auḍulomi.

Rāmānuja also explains the sūtra on the similar lines as Śaṅkara.

Madhva explains the sūtra in this way. Though Devas have the larger share in the fruits of jñāna, the sādhakas too have a limited share. Their case is similar to that of the ṛtviks in a sacrifice where a portion of the fruit accrues to them also.

Vallabha explains the sūtra in this way. When a sacrificer chooses a priest, the priest is of the sacrificer.

Similarly when the Lord has chosen the jīva, the jīva is of the Lord.

The next sūtra is श्रुतेश्च। (4-4-46) And because the śruti so declares. In the śruti it is said यां वै कांचन यज्ञ ऋत्विज आशिषमाशासत इति यजमानायैव तामाशासत इति होवाच। (Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 1-3-1-26). Whatever blessings the priest pray for at the sacrifice, they pray for the good of the sacrificer, thus he said. तस्मादु हैवंविदुद्गाता ब्रूयात्कं

1. One hundred and twelve Upaniṣads and their Philosophy, Dr. A. N. Bhattacharya, p. 515

ते काममागायानि। (C.U. 1-7-8-9) Therefore an Udgātṛ who knows this may say; what wish shall I obtain for you by my singing. Thus meditations on subordinate parts of the sacrifice are the works of the priest. a rich tone in his voice. Being possessed of such a voice, he performs the duties of a ṛtvij priest. Therefore, people desire to see at a sacrifice a priest with good voice. (B.U. 1-3-25)

Śrutis pointed out by P.M. Modi[1] are also pertinent.

So along with Śaṅkara's these śrutis also can be the v.v. as they also belong to the same topic.

Sahakāryantaravidhyadhikaraṇam (3-4-47 to 49) The adhikaraṇa has the following three sūtras:

(i) सहकार्यन्तरविधिः पक्षेण तृतीयं तद्गतो विध्यादिवत्। (3-4-47)

(ii) कृत्स्नभावात्तु गृहिणोपसंहारः। (3-4-48)

(iii) मौनवदितरेषामप्युपदेशात्। (3-4-49)

The first sūtra is सहकार्यन्तरविधिः पक्षेण तृतीयं तद्गतो विध्यादिवत्। (3-4-47) (silent meditation is) Injunction of another auxiliary (to knowledge) which is a third one (besides the two expressly enjoined) as an alternative (where perfect knowledge has not arisen) ·to him who is such (i.e. the saṁnyāsin possessing knowledge); as in the case of injunctions and the like.

A passage from the B.U. is discussed तस्माद्ब्राह्मणः पाण्डित्यं निर्विद्य बाल्येन तिष्ठासेद्बाल्यं च पाण्डित्यं च निर्विद्याथ मुनिरमौनं (B.U. 3-5-1) Therefore, let a Brāhmaṇa after he has done with learning wish to stand by a childlike state; and after he has done with the childlike state and learning (he is or may be) a muni, and after he has done with what constitutes muniship and non-muniship (he is or may be) a Brāhmaṇa. The question is raised in regard to this passage whether silent meditation is enjoined or not. The opponent holds that it is not, since there is no word indicating an injunction. The text says that he becomes a muni, a silent meditator whereas, with regard to learning and the state of a child it expressly enjoins one should remain endowed with them. Besides learning includes silent meditation. The sūtra rebuts this view and states that silent meditation is enjoined as a third requisite besides learning and the

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, pp. 292-293

state of a child. Silent meditation is not merely learning but continuous devotion to knowledge. It has, therefore, the weight of an injunction.

Rāmānuja follows Śaṅkara

The sūtra, according to Madhva, points out that as in the case of kings who are required by law to rule over their subjects with justice and of teachers who are similarly required to impart spiritual instruction to their disciples, the primary fruits of the kings rule and the teacher's exposition accrue to them, while the king's subjects and the teachers pupils derive only a small portion of the benefit on account of their being auxiliaries (sahakārīs) in the business of good government and imparting knowledge.

Vallabha says that, out of the three means of body, speech and mind, the third is the main.

P.M. Modi's interpretation is different. He cites the B.U. तमेतं वेदानुवचनेन ब्राह्मणा विविदिषन्ति यज्ञेन दानेन तपसाऽनाशकेन। (B.U. 4-4-22) Him, the Brahmanas seek to know by the study of the Veda, by sacrifices, by gifts, by penance, by fasting. According to P.M. Modi, वेदानुवचन is a सहकारिकर्म for knowing कर्म.[1] Now it is difficult to agree to this statement. In fact, वेदानुवचन may be considered the very basis.

The second sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is कृत्स्नभावात्तु गृहिणोऽपसंहार: (3-4-48) On account (of the householder's life) being all, however, there is the conclusion with the enumeration of the duties of the householder. In the C.U. in the passage आचार्यकुलाद् वेदमधीत्य यथाविधानम् गुरो: कर्म अतिशेषेण अभिसमावृत्य कुटुम्बे स्थित्वा शुचौ देशे स्वाध्यायमधीयानो धार्मिकान् विदधद् आत्मनि सर्वेन्द्रियाणि संप्रतिष्ठाप्य अहिंसन् सर्वाणि भूतानि अन्यत्र तीर्थेभ्य: स खल्वेवं वर्तयन् यावदायुषं ब्रह्मलोकमभिसंपद्यते न च पुनरावर्तते न च पुनरावर्तते। (C.U. 8-15-1) He who has learned the Veda, from the family of a teacher, according to rule, in the time left over from doing work for a teacher, he, who, after having come back again settles down in a home of his own, continues the study of what he has learnt and has virtuous sons, he who concentrates all his senses in the self, who practises non-hatred to all creatures except at holy places, he who behaves thus throughout his life reaches the Brahmanhood.

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, pp. 295-296

In the passage after enumerating the duties of brahmacārin, those of the householder are mentioned but there is no mention of saṁnyāsa. This, the sūtra says, is only to lay emphasis on the householder's life and its importance. The householder's life includes more or less the duties of all āśramas.

Rāmānuja quotes the B.U. ब्राह्मणा: पौषणायाश्च वित्तैषणायाश्च लोकैषणायाश्च व्युत्थायाथ भिक्षाचर्यं चरन्ति (b.u. 3-5-1) The Brāhmaṇas, having known that self, having overcome the desire for sons, the desire for wealth, the desire for worlds, live the life of mendicants.

Madhva quotes from some Pautrāyaṇa śruti.

Vallabha cites the same passage referred to by Śaṅkara, According to Vallabha, the sūtra states the conclusion of the śruti passage is done with the householder because total devótion is possible only in the stage of a householder.

P.M. Modi takes the word उपसंहार in the sense of collection[1] [100] while Śaṅkara and other commentators have taken it in the sense of conclusion.

The next sūtra is मौनवदितरेषामप्युपदेशात्। (3-4-49) On account of there being injunction of the others also, in the same way as of the state of a silent meditator.

Even as the scriptures enjoin the states of saṁnyāsa and the householder's life, they enjoin all the four stages of life either in sequence or alternatively. The C.U. states तप एव द्वितीयो ब्रह्मचर्याचार्यकुलवासी तृतीय: । (C.U. 2-3-1) Austerity is the second and to dwell as a student in the house of a teacher is the third.

Rāmānuja's explanation is similar to that of Śaṅkara,

Madhva quotes a Pautrāyaṇa śruti and Kaunṭharavya śruti.

Vallabha explains that as in the case of Saṁnyāsins, for the devotees also, there is an instruction of observing the vow of silence and other vows.

P.M. Modi explains the sūtra in this way 'This sūtra gives another reason why a householder should carry out all the सहकारिन् to the knowledge of Brahman' (उपसंहार:) । P.M. Modi thinks that मौनवत् refers to B.U. (एतं वै तमत्मानं विदित्वा... मुनिरमौनं च मौनं च

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, pp. 297-298

निर्विद्याथ ब्राह्मण: । (B.U. 3-5-1)[1] which has already been discussed in the sūtra (3-4-43) of this adhikaraṇa.

Anāviṣkārādhikaraṇam (3-4-50)

This is a one-sūtra adhikaraṇa. The sūtra is अनाविष्कुर्वन्नन्वयात्। (3-4-50) The childlike state (means) not manifesting himself on account of the context. The passage from the B.U. is under discussion तस्माद्ब्राह्मण: पाण्डित्यं निर्विद्य बाल्येन तिष्ठासेत्। (B.U. 3-5-1) Therefore, let a Brāhmaṇa after he has done with learning wish to stand by a childlike state. The question is: Is childlike state a state of ignorance of right and wrong or of doing what one likes or is it one of freedom from guile and the sense of egoism? The answer is, it is the latter, because former is detrimental to knowledge.

Rāmānuja explains the sūtra in the same way.

According to Madhva, the sūtra states that aparokṣajñānin should impart the vidyā leading to illumination in strict privacy to deserving persons alone, and should not declare it in public lest it should fall in the hands of undeserving persons.

According to Vallabha, the sūtra states that a devotee has not to make it public his relations with the lord as the devotee is connected with Lord.

Aihikādhikaraṇam (3-4-51)

This is also a one-sūtra adhikaraṇa. The sūtra is ऐहिकमप्यप्रस्तुतप्रतिबन्धे तद्दर्शनात्। (3-4-51) In this life also, (the fruition of knowledge may take place), if no obstruction is present on account of this being seen in the scripture. Knowledge arises in this life when its rise is not obstructed by some other works whose results are reaching maturity. When there is such an obstruction, then knowledge arises in the next life. Śaṅkara quotes from the Kaṭha U. श्रवणायापि बहुभिर्यो न लभ्य: शृण्वन्तोऽपि बहवो यं न विदु:। आश्चर्योऽस्य वक्ता कुशलोऽस्य लब्धाऽश्चर्यो ज्ञाता कुशलानुशिष्ट:। (Kaṭha. U. 2-7) He of whom many are not even able to hear, whom many even when they hear of him do not comprehend, wonderful is a man when found who is able to teach him, wonderful is he who comprehends him when taught by an able teacher.

Rāmānuja says that vidyā whose result is mere exaltation, abhyudaya takes place in the present life, if there is no

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, pp. 299-300

obstruction in the form of another forceful karma, prabalakarmāntara. In that case, knowledge arises after.

According to Madhva, the sūtra states that there is no invariable rule that aparokṣa jñāna arises in the same life in which the quantum of sādhanas is completed. It may arise in another life.

Muktiphalādhikaraṇam (3-4-52)

This is the last adhikaraṇa of the fourth pāda of the third adhyāya. It has only one and the last sūtra

एवं मुक्तिफलानियमस्तदवस्थावधृतेस्तदवस्थाधृतेः। (3-4-52)

There is no rule like this with respect to liberation, the fruit (of knowledge) on account of the assertions as to that condition, on account of the assertions as to that condition.

The question is raised whether there is any rule with regard to liberation which is the fruit of knowledge, whether it can be delayed after knowledge arises. The sūtra states that no such rule exists. And the nature of final release is the same and there can be no variations of it, as the śruti passages one after another point out. अस्थूलमनणु (B.U. 3-8-8). It is neither course nor fine. स एष नेति नेत्यात्मा। (B.U. 3-9-26) That self is to be described by No, No यत्र नान्यत्पश्यति। (C.U. 7-24-1) Where one sees nothing else. ब्रह्मैवेदममृतं पुरस्तात्। (M.U. 2-2-11) That Immortal Brahman is before. स वा एष महानज आत्माऽजरोऽमरोऽमृतोऽभयो ब्रह्म। (B.U. 4-4-25). This great unborn self, undecaying, undying, immortal, fearless, is indeed Brahman. इदं सर्वं यदयमात्मा। This everything is that self. यत्र त्वस्य सर्वमात्मैवाभूत्तत्केन कं पश्येत्। (B.U. 4-5-15)

When the self is all this, how should he see another. Rāmānuja interprets the sūtra on the same lines.

Here ends the fourth pāda of the third Sādhanādhyāya.

CHAPTER - 9

THE VIṢAYAVĀKYAS IN THE FIRST AND SECOND PĀDA OF THE PHALĀDHYĀYA

The fourth adhyāya, as its traditional designation phalādhyāya indicates, deals with the fruit or the nature of mokṣa. The first pāda, however, devotes a few of its adhikaraṇas to the consideration etc. which ultimately lead to liberation.

The first pāda begins with **Āvṛttyadhikaraṇam** (4-1-1,2)

The adhikaraṇa has the following two sūtras :

(i) आवृत्तिरसकृदपदेशात्। (4-1-1)

(ii) लिङ्गाच्च। (4-l-2)

The first sūtra is आवृत्तिरसकृदुपदेशात्। (4-1-1) Repetition (of hearing, reflection, and meditation on the self is necessary) on account of the instruction (which is given) more than once. Śruti says आत्मा वा अरे द्रष्टव्य: श्रोतव्यो मन्तव्यो निदिध्यासितव्य:। (B.U. 4-5-7) Verily the self is to be seen, to be heard, to be thought, to he reflected on. तमेव धीरो विज्ञाय प्रज्ञां कुर्वीत। (B.U. 4-4-21) Let a wise Brāhmaṇa after be has discovered him practise wisdom सोऽन्वेष्टव्य: स विजिज्ञासितव्य:। (C.U. 8-7-1) That it is we must search out, that it is which we must try to understand.

These Śrutis require us to realise the self through hearing, reflection and meditation. The question is whether this is to be done once or repeatedly. The answer is that it is to be repeated till the knowledge of Brahman arises.

According to Rāmānuja, the act of knowledge of Brahman indicated in the Vedānta texts is to be performed repeatedly, more than once.

Madhva also holds that śravaṇa, manana are all to be constantly and repeatedly gone through and not only once (to yield their fruit) as in the case of the performance of rites and sacrifices.

Vallabha also explains the sūtra in the same way. He cites from the C.U., the episode of Śvetaketu who was repeatedly, for nine times to be exact, instructed about Brahman.

The passages from the B.U. and C.U. may be regarded as the V.V.s of this sūtra.

According to P.M. Modi, the साधनs have been completely mentioned in B. S. III and that now the condition of a seeker who has carried out those साधन s is described in B.S. 4-1-1.

P. M. Modi takes the word आवृत्तिः in the sense of return i.e. return to this world, and hence he cites the different passages from the B.U. and C.U.

ते य एवमेतद्विदुर्ये चामी अरण्ये श्रद्धां सत्यमुपासते तेऽर्चिरभिसंभवन्ति। अर्चिषोऽहः। अह्न आपूर्यमाणपक्षम्। आपूर्यमाणपक्षाद्यान्षण्मासानुदङङोदङ्कादित्य एति। मासेभ्यो देवलोकम्। देवलोकादादित्यम्। आदित्याद्वैद्युतम्। तान्वैद्युतान्पुरुषो मानस एत्य ब्रह्मलोकान्गमयति। ते तेषु ब्रह्मलोकेषु पराः परावतो वसन्ति। तेषां न पुनरावृत्तिः। (B.U. 6-2-15)

Those who know this as such and those too who meditate with faith in the forest on the truth, pass into the light, from light into the day, from the day into the half month of the waxing moon, from the half month of the waxing moon into the six months during which the sun travels northword, from these months into the world of the gods, from the world of the gods into the sun, from the sun into the lighting. Then a person consisting of mind goes to those regions of lighting and leads them to the worlds of Brahmā. In those worlds of Brahmā they live for long periods. Of these there is no return 9.4 C.U. Says तद्वैतद्ब्रह्मा प्रजापतय उवाच प्रजापतिर्मनवे मनुः प्रजाभ्यः। आचार्यकुला द्वेदंमधीत्य यथाविधानं गुरोः कर्मातिशेषेणाभिसमावृत्य कुटुम्बे शुचौ देशे स्वाध्यायमधीयानो धार्मिकान्विदधदात्मनि सर्वेन्द्रियाणि संप्रतिष्ठाप्याहिंसन्सर्वभूतान्यन्यत्र तीर्थेभ्यः। स खल्वेवं वर्तयन्यावदायुषं ब्रह्मलोकमभिसंपद्यते। न च पुनरावर्तते न च पुनरावर्तते। (C.U. 8-15-1)

This Brahmā told to Prajāpati, Prajāpati to Manu, Manu to mankind. He who has learned the Veda from the family of a teacher, according to rule, in the time of left over from doing work for the teacher, he, who after having come back again, settles down in a home of his own, continues the study of what he has learnt, and has virtuous sons, he who concentrates all his senses in the self, who practises non-hatred to all creatures except at holy places, he who behaves thus throughout his life reaches the Brahmaworld, does not return hither again.

It is evident that there is a difference of opinion between the ancient commentators like Śaṅkara and P.M. Modi, a modern scholar regarding the meaning of the word आवृत्तिः[1]

What happens to the departed soul and its itinery, we think, have already been discussed in the third adhyāya. So perhaps it is more pertiment to take the sūtra the way ancient commentators have taken. Moreover, it is worth noting that Śaṅkara has taken the sūtra 4-1-1 to 12 as साधनशेष remaining discussion of the means.

The second sūtra is लिङ्गाच्च। (4-1-2) And on account of the introductory mark. Repetition is necessary for if it were not so, scriptures would not teach, the doctrine, repeatedly. Śaṅkara quotes a Śruti आदित्य उद्गीथः। रश्मींस्त्वं पर्यावर्तयातु। (C.U. 1-5-12) The udgītha is the yonder son. Reflect on the rays.

Rāmānuja and Vallabha understood स्मृति by लिङ्ग. He cites the Viṣṇupurāṇa.

P.M. Modi quotes the B.G.

अनेकजन्मसंसिद्धस्ततो याति परं पदम्। (B. G. 6-45)

बहूनां जन्मनामन्ते ज्ञानवान्मां प्रपद्यते। (B. G. 7-19)

Ḥaving accomplished after many births, he goes to the highest place.

The person with knowledge attains me at the end of many births.

First of all, it is not usual to take the word लिङ्ग in the sense of Smṛti, particularly in the context of the repeated instruction by śruti, which implies some marks lying scattered in the Śruti passages.

Ātmatvopāsanādhikaraṇam (4-1-3)

This is one-sūtra-adhikaraṇa. The sūtra is आत्मेति तूपगच्छन्ति ग्राह्यन्ति (4-1-3) But as the Self, (Scriptural texts) acknowledge and also make us comprehend.

The Lord is to be contemplated as the self in the form of I am Brahman. B.U. very clearly says अथ योऽन्यां देवतामुपास्तेऽन्यो सावन्योऽहमस्मीति न स वेद। (B.U. 1-4-10) Now if a man worships another deity, thinking the deity is one and he another, he does

1. Modi P. M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, pp. 310

not know so the Supreme Lord is to be understood as identical with the self of the Seeker.

According to Vallabha, the sūtra means jñānins meditate and understand the Lord as their own self.

P.M. Modi refers to the 1-1-29-30 sūtras, and Śrutis referred to by them, i.e. Kau. U. 3-2 and B.U. 1-4-10[1]

Śaṅkara's interpretation seems to be in consonance with the wording of the sūtra, in which the identity of the self with the Brahman is stated.

Pratikādhikaraṇam (4-1-4)

This is also a one-sūtra-adhikaraṇa. The sūtra is न प्रतीके न हि सः। (4-1-4) The meditator is not (to see the self) in the symbol, because he is not (that). If an Upaniṣad says मनो ब्रह्मेत्युपासीतेत्यध्यात्ममथाधिदैवतमाकाशो ब्रह्मेति। (C.U. 3-18-1) Let a man meditate on mind as Brahman, this is said with reference to the body. Let a man meditate on ether as Brahman; this is said with reference to the Devas.

Here the mind is not to be identified with the self. If the mind is cognised as identical with Brahman, then it ceases to be a symbol.

Rāmānuja includes the next sūtra also in the adhikaraṇa. He explains the sūtra in the same way as Śaṅkara.

According to Madhva, the adhikaraṇa and the sūtra prescribes that Brahman should only be meditated upon as being present in the symbols and not as being identical with them due to a mistaken notion of identity induced by the surface sense of wording or by the presence of case-apposition (विभक्तिसामानाधिकरण्य) as in मनो हि ब्रह्म।

Vallabha reads the sūtra differently प्रतीकेन हि सः।

Only by the symbols release cannot be effected.

Brahmadṛṣṭyadhikaraṇam (4-1-5)

This adhikaraṇa has one sūtra i.e. ब्रह्मदृष्टिरुत्कर्षात् (The symbol is) to be viewed as Brahman (and not in the opposite way) on account of exaltation (bestowed on symbols). The symbols are to be regarded as Brahman and not vice-versa. We can make

1. Modi P. M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, pp. 314-315

progress only by looking upon an inferior object as symbolic of the superior and not vice-versa. Since our objective is to get rid of the idea of diversity and see Brahman in everything, we have to meditate on the symbols as Brahman.

Rāmānuja further elucidates the point that Brahmadṛṣṭi is proper in the mind etc, but not mind in Brahman. Inferior things should be looked upon as superior, and not viceversa.

Though P.M. Modi explains the sūtra differently but, his v.v. would be the same as that of Śaṅkara and others.[1]

Ādityādimatyadhikaraṇam (4-1-6)

This is also a one-sūtra-adhikaraṇa. The sūtra is

आदित्यादिमतयश्चाङ्ग उपपत्तेः (4-1-6) And the ideas of the sun and so on (are to be imposed) on the subordinate members (of sacrificial acts) because, (in that way, would the statement of the scriptures) be consistent.

In the C.U. it is stated य एवासौ तपति तमुद्गीथमुपासीत। (C.U. 1-3-1) He who burns up there, let a man meditate upon him as Udgītha लोकेषु पञ्चविधं सामोपासीत। (C.U. 2-2-1) Let a man meditate the fivefold Sāman, in the worlds. वाचि सप्तविधं सामोपासीत। Let a man meditate on the sevenfold sāman in speech. Here the members of the sacrificial acts are to be viewed as the sun and so on. By so doing the fruit of the act is enhanced. This is to be done if the statements of the scriptures that the meditations enhance the fruits of the sacrifice are to be fulfilled.

Rāmānuja says that only through the propitiation of gods are sacrifices capable of bringing about their results.

B.N.K. Sharma explains Madhva on this sūtra in the following words, 'The Siddhānta is that the gods must always meditate on the respective limbs of Brahmā whence they have their genesis because they enter into them at the time of their mukti and such entry cannot be achieved without their meditating on the lord as the possessor of such limbs as this essential attribute.'[2]

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, pp. 319-320
2. Sharma B.N.K.: The Brahmasūtra and Their Principal Commentaries, Vol. III, P. 605

For Vallabha, this adhikaraṇa is made up of five sūtras viz. 5 to 10. According to him, the sūtra holds that the meditation on āditya etc. as Brahman is in fact a part of the Brahman with attributes.

P. M. Modi differs from Śaṅkara and explains the sūtra in this manner. 'In this sūtra, the sūtrakāra seems to tell us how he looks upon the sun, the fire etc. which are the limbs of Brahman.' He cites from the M.U. अग्निमूर्धा चक्षुषी चन्द्रसूर्यो दिशः श्रोत्रे वाग्विवृताश्च वेदाः। वायुः प्राणो हृदयं विश्वमस्य पद्भ्यां पृथिवी ह्येष सर्वभूतान्तरात्मा। (M.U. 2-1-4) He looks upon the sun etc. as the अङ्ग or body of Brahman, and teaches them to others as such. P. M. Modi connects this sūtra to the sūtra 4-1-3 (उपगच्छन्ति ग्राहयन्ति च)।[1]

Āsīnādhikaraṇam (4-1-7 to 10) The adhikaraṇa has the following four sūtras:

(i) आसीनः सम्भवात्। (4-1-7)

(ii) ध्यानाच्च। (4-1-8)

(iii) अचलत्वं चापेक्ष्य। (4-1-9)

(iv) स्मरन्ति च। (4-1-10)

The first sūtra is आसीनः सम्भवात् (4-1-7) Seated (man is to meditate) on account of the possibility. One is to meditate seated. It is not feasible or comfortable to meditate standing or lying down, as in Upāsanā one has to concentrate one's mind on a single object.

Rāmānuja says that the needful concentration of mind can be reached in a sitting position for standing and walking demand effort, lying down may induce sleep.

Madhva also explains the sūtra on similar lines.

The sūtra deals with some bodily posture and hence, need not have any v.v. as such.

The next sūtra is ध्यानाच्च। (4-1-8) And on account of meditation. Śaṅkara says that upāsanā and dhyāna mean the same thing concentrating on a single object with a fixed look and without any movement of the limbs. This is possible only in a sitting posture.

---

1. Modi P. M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, pp. 320-322

The sūtra gives one more reason why sitting posture is preferable to any other posture.

The next sūtra is अचलत्वं चापेक्ष्य। (4-1-9) And with reference to immobility. Immobility or steadiness is necessary for meditation.

Śaṅkara quotes ध्यायतीव पृथिवी (C.U. 7-6-1) The earth, is meditating as it were.

According to P. M. Modi, 'Śaṅkara unnecessarily connects this sūtra with Śrutis like C.U. 7-6-1'[1] But, it may be stated that by association, Śaṅkara might have been reminded of the C.U. passage as one of the synomyms of the earth is अचला[2]

The last sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is स्मरन्ति च। (4-1-10) The smṛti texts also say the same.

Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja and Madhva quote the relevant passage

शुचौ देशे प्रतिष्ठाप्य स्थिरमासनामात्मनः। (B.G. 6-11)

P.M. Modi writes 'The Upaniṣads do not mention the seeker in an advanced stage as keeping, sitting or do not generally mention his behaviour, thereby the sūtrakāra does not refer to a śruti, but he refers to a smṛti because, the smṛti, particularly the Bhagavadgītā mentions, the behaviour of an advanced student.' According to P.M. Modi, the sūtrakāra seems to refer to

तानि सर्वाणि संयम्य युक्त आसीत मत्परः।
वशे हि यस्येन्द्रियाणि तस्य प्रज्ञा प्रतिष्ठिता॥

and to

उदासीनवदासीनो गुणैर्यो न विचाल्यते।
गुणा वर्तन्त इत्येव योऽवतिष्ठति नेङ्गते॥ (B.G. XIV 23)[3]

We may submit here, that, the verse 6-1 of the B.G. might have been intended by the sūtrakāra, But the verse XIV-23 of the B.G. might not possibly have been referred to by the sūtrakāra as the adhikaraṇa is dealing with the physical or bodily posture whereas in the verse XIV-23, the general attitude of a seeker has been depicted. So, if this submission of ours is correct, then, the verse quoted by our ancient commentators is more appropriate to the context.

---

1. Modi P. M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, p. 325
2. Amarakośa 2-1-2
3. Modi P. M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, pp. 325-326

Ekāgratādhikaraṇam (4-1-11)

This is a one-sūtra-adhikaraṇa. The sūtra is यत्रैकाग्रता तत्राविशेषात्। (4-1-11) Where concentration of mind (is possible) these (meditations may be carried on) on account of there being no difference.

One can meditate at any time, in any place and in any direction where one can with ease concentrate his mind. These are certain directions given as in the S.U.

समे शुचौ शर्करावह्निवालुकाविवर्जिते शब्दजलाश्रयादिभिः।
मनोऽनुकूले न तु चक्षुपीडने गुहानिवाताश्रयणे प्रयोजयेत्॥
(चक्षुपीडने... छान्दसो विसर्गलोपः — शा. भा.) (S.U. 2-10)

Let a man aapply himself to meditation in a level and clean place, free from pebbles, fire and dust, noises, standing water and the like, favourable to the mind not infested by what hurts the eyes, full of caves and shelters.

These are only suggestions.

Rāmānuja and Madhva also explain in the same way.

According to Vallabha, the sūtra holds that, where the devotees are concentrated in their minds upon the Lord; there is no difference among the devotees whether they have an inner vision or external vision of the Lord.

Āprāyaṇādhikaraṇam (4-1-12)

This is also a one-sūtra-adhikaraṇa. The sūtra is आ प्रायणात्तत्रापि हि दृष्टम्। (4-1-12) Till death, (meditations have to be continued) because (their continuance) even at that moment is seen (in scripture). The meditations are to be continued till death for the śruti and smṛti say so. As the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa says स यावत्क्रतुरयमस्माल्लोकात्प्रैति। With whatever thought he passes away from this world. The B.G. also says यं यं वापि स्मरन्भावं त्यजत्यन्ते कलेवरम्। तं तमेवैति कौन्तेय सदा तद्भावभावितः। (B.G. 8-6) Remembering whatever form of being he in the end leaves this body into the same form he ever passes assimilated to its being.

Rāmānuja quotes from the C.U. स खल्वेवं वर्तयन्यावदायुषं ब्रह्मलोकमभिसंपद्यते। (C.U. 8-15-1) He who behaves thus throughout his life reaches the Brahma world.

Madhava explains that till release, one should perform such action. स यो ह वै तद्भगवन्मनुष्येषु प्रायणोन्तगोङ्कारमभिध्यायीत। (P.U. 5-1) Venerable Sir, he who among men meditates on Aum until the end of his life.

P.M. Modi refers to the śruti cited by Madhava.

If we take into account the factor that the śruti quoted by Śaṅkara is outside the Upaniṣadic Lore, then the śruti quoted by Madhva and suggested by P.M. Modi is preferrable, However, it is not unusual to quote from the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, as it has been done before also.

Tadadhigamādhikaraṇam (4-1-13)

This is also a one-sūtra-adhikaraṇa. The sūtra is

तदधिगम उत्तरपूर्वाघयोरश्लेषविनाशौ तद्व्यपदेशात्। (4-1-13)

On the attainment of this (Brahman) (there occur) the non-clinging and the destruction of the later and the earlier sinful deeds because it is (so) declared (in the scriptures).

The question here relates to the state of jīvanmukti or liberation in life. If it is said that one must experience the results of one's deeds committed before the attainment of liberation, the sūtra observes that when a person attains knowledge, all his earlier demerits are destroyed and later ones do not cling to him. The C.U. states.

यथा पुष्करपलाश आपो न श्लिष्यन्त एवमेवंविदि पापं कर्म न श्लिष्यते। (C.U. 4-14-3) As water does not cling to a lotus-leaf, so evil deed does not cling to him who know this.

Again तद्यथेषीकातूलमग्नौ प्रोतं प्रदूयेतैवं हास्य सर्वे पाप्मानः प्रदूयन्ते। (C.U. 5-24-3) As the fibers of the iṣikā read when thrown into the fire are burned, thus his sins are burned.

Or again

भिद्यते हृदयग्रन्थिश्छिद्यन्ते सर्वसंशयाः। (M.U. 2-2-8)

The fetter of the heart is broken, all doubts are solved, extinguished are all his works when he has been beheld who is high and low.

Rāmānuja's, Madhava's and Vallabha's explanation is on the same line.

For Madhva, the adhikaraṇa continues till the end of the pāda (13-19)

P.M. Modi observes about Śaṅkara's interpretation. Śaṅkara takes तदधिगमे in the sense of 'on the attainment of Brahman.' But the contrast of तदधिगमे with पाते तु in the next sūtra and the word एवंविदि in the śruti and also the context of the preceding sūtras show that तदधिगमे means on the attainment of the knowledge of Brahman.[1]

Now is this not the case of protesting too much on the part of the learned scholar? Looking to his scholarship, does he need to be informed that for Śaṅkara, 'attainment of the knowledge of Brahman' is no different from the 'on the attainment of Brahman?'

Itarasaṁsleṣādhikaraṇam (4-1-14)

The sūtra is इतरस्याप्येवमसंश्लेषः पाते तु। (4-1-14) Of the other, (i.e. good works) also there is in the same way non-clinging but on the fall (of the body i.e. death.).

The knower of Brahman since he is bereft on any sense of agency goes beyond good and evil. As the B.U. states उभे उ हैवेष एते तरति। (B.U. 4-4-22) He indeed, overcomes both. Since he is not affected by good or evil after illumination and his past sins are destroyed by knowledge, his liberation takes place at death.

Rāmānuja says that good works which produce results favourable to knowledge and meditation perish only on the death of the body and not during the lifetime of the meditator,

P.M. Modi does not agree to the śrutis quoted by Śaṅkara.[2]

Anārabdhādhikaraṇam (4-1-15)

This is also a one-sūtra-adhikaraṇa. The sūtra is अनारब्धकार्ये एव तु पूर्वे तदवधेः। (4-1-15) But only those former (works) whose effects have not yet begun (are destroyed by knowledge) because (scripture states that) death is the limit.

There are two kinds of karmans viz. Saṃcita, accumulated works and Prārabdha Karmans which have already begun to operate and had produced the body through which the person has attained knowledge. The sūtra says that Prārabdha works have to be worked out or enjoyed so long as the momentum of the works lasts, the knower of Brahman has to be in the body. When they

---

1. Modi P. M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, pp. 334-335
2. Ibid., pp. 335-337

are exhausted, the body falls and the knower attains perfection as the C.U. states तस्य तावदेव चिरं यावन्न विमोक्ष्येऽथ संपत्स्ये। (C.U. 6-14-2)

For him, there is delay only as long as he is not delivered (from the body)

Rāmānuja says that there is no proof for the existence of an impetus accounting for the continuance of the body's life, other than the Lord's pleasure or displeasure caused by good or evil deeds.

Madhva explains on the same line as Śaṅkara.

According to Vallabha, the works other than Prārabdha get destroyed and its limit also depends upon the will.

Agnihotrādyadhikaraṇam (4-1-16, 17)

The adhikaraṇa comprises two sūtras viz.

(i) अग्निहोत्रादि तु तत्कार्यायैव तद्दर्शनात्। (4-1-16)

(ii) अतोऽन्यापि ह्येकेषामुभुयो:। (4-1-17)

The first sūtra is अग्निहोत्रादि तु तत्कार्यायैव तद्दर्शनात्। (4-1-16) But (the results of daily) agnihotra etc. (are not destroyed by knowledge as they) contribute to the same result (as knowledge) because that is seen (from the scriptures).

Works are of two kinds, those which yield specific results and those which help to produce knowledge. Obligatory regular works performed before the rise of knowledge are of the latter kind. Since knowledge leads to liberation the regular works may be, said to contribute indirectly to that, Śruti says तमेतं वेदानुवचनेन ब्राह्मणा विविदिषन्ति यज्ञेन दानेन। (B.U. 4-4-22) Brāhmaṇas seek to know him by the study of the Veda, by sacrifices, by gifts. So their results persist till death.

For Rāmānuja, this adhikaraṇa has three sūtras (16-18)

Rāmānuja too explains the sūtra in the same way.

According to Madhva also, the sūtra states that agnihotra etc. are for experience of liberation. The sūtra according to Madhva, holds that, good deeds past and future and the jñānins, niṣkāmakarmas like agnihotra are not destroyed not do they fail to cling to him. They are assets to jñāna and do nor at all come in the way of jñānin's attaining mokṣa. For Madhva the reference to the passage is from B.U.

स एनमविदितो न भुनक्ति यदि हवा आयनेवंवित् महत्पुण्यं करोति तद्धास्यान्ततः क्षीयते एवं य आत्मानमेव लोकमुपास्ते न हास्य कर्म क्षीयते अस्माद्धयेवात्मनो यद्यत्कामयते तत्तत् सृजते। (B.U. 1-4-15) Just as the Vedas not properly studied under a guru or duties not performed properly are not productive of fruit, so also the Lord, if not known correctly does not permit the ignorant one to enjoy bliss. If he who knows not the Lord performs any meritorious deed, it decays. Therefore, he shall meditate on the lord as the abode and the guide. He who meditates on the Lord as his abode and guide, his works are undecaying.

Vallabha says that the works like agnihotra etc. should be performed to exhaust the prārabdha works. Thus it is seen in the śruti. According to P.M. Modi, the sūtra refers to C.U. 2-23-1, which lays down आश्रमकर्मन् for a seeker.[1]

The next sūtra is अतोऽन्यापि ह्येकेषामुभयोः। (4-1-17) According to some (there is) also (a class of good works साधुकृत्या) other than this, (there is agreement) of both (teachers) as to the result of these works.

Besides the obligatory works like the daily agnihotra and the like, there are other good works which are performed with a view to certain results. Of these latter works it is said that सुहृदः साधुकृत्यामुपयन्ति। (Kau. U. 1-4)

His friends enter on his good works, Both Jaimini and Bādarāyaṇa are agreed that works undertaken for the fulfilment of some special wish do not contribute to the origination of the knowledge.

According to Rāmānuja, both types of works are means, either prior or subsequent to the rise of knowledge.

According to Madhva, the sūtra deals with the Kāmyakarmans, one of the two alternatives, the other beings niṣkāmakarmans. Kāmyakarmans are of two types: iṣṭa and aniṣṭa. The iṣṭas are not lost. The aniṣṭa are distributed among the spiritual friends of a jñānin.

For Vallabha, a new adhikaraṇa begins with this sūtra (17-19). For a devotee, following puṣṭimārga merit and demerit both get destroyed even without enjoyment.

---

1. Modi P. M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, pp. 339-340

Vidyājñānasādhanādhikaraṇam (4-1-18)

This is a one-sūtra-adhikaraṇa. The sūtra is यदेव विद्ययेति हि। (4-1-18) For (the statement) whether he does with knowledge (indicates this). The reference is to the C.U. य एवं विद्वान्यजति य एवं विद्वान्जुहोति य एवं विद्वाञ्छंसति, य एवं विद्वान्गायति तस्मादेवंविदमेव ब्रह्माणं कुर्वीत नानेवंविदम्। (C.U. 4-17-10) तेनोभौ कुरुतो यश्चैतदेवं वेद यश्च न वेद। (C.U. 1-1-10)

He, who knowing this, sacrifices, he who knowing this makes an offering, he who knowing this recites, he who knowing this sings. Therefore let a man make him who knows this his, Brahman-priest. Therefore both perform the work, he who knows this and he who dees not know it.

According to Śaṅkara, all obligatory works performed before the rise of the knowledge, whether with or without knowledge either in the present life or in the previous one, help attain the release. For Śaṅkara and there is a reference to the passage यदेव विद्यया तां करोति तदेव वीर्यवत्तरम्। (C.U. 1-1-10) What one performs with knowledge indeed becomes more powerful.

Madhva, and Vallabha explain the sūtra like Śaṅkara,

Itarakṣapaṇādhikaraṇam (4-1-19)

This is the last adhikaraṇa of the pāda. It has only one sūtra i.e. भोगेन त्वितरे क्षयित्वा संपद्यते। (4-1-19) But having exhausted by enjoyment the two other (set of works) he becomes one with Brahman.

When the works good and bad which have begun to bear fruit are exhausted through enjoyment one attains oneness with Brahman. C.U. says तस्य तावदेव चिरं यावन्न विमोक्ष्येऽथ संपत्स्ये। (C.U. 6-14-2) For him there is delay so long as he is not delivered (from the body), then he will become one with Brahman.

Rāmānuja explains the sūtra in the same way.

According to Madhva, Brahman is attained when the merit and demerit are exhausted, through enjoyment.

Vallabha takes इतरे to mean two kinds of bodies: and लिङ्गं, and explains that having destroyed these two kinds of bodies, he enjoys all pleasures with Brahman. Vallabha refers to the śruti सोऽश्नुते सर्वान् कामान् सह ब्रह्मणा विपश्चिता। (T.U. 2-1) He enjoys all desires with knowing Brahman.

According to P. M. Modi, the word इतरे means 'other than those discussed in the preceding sūtras i.e. other than आरब्धकार्य, पूर्वकर्मन्s.[1]

Vāgadhikaraṇam (4-2, 1, 2)

The adhikaraṇa has the following two sūtras viz.

(i) वाङ्मनसि दर्शनाच्छब्दाच्च। (4-2-1)

(ii) अत एव सर्वाण्यनु। (4-2-2)

The first sūtra is वाङ्ङनसि दर्शनाच्छब्दाच्च। (4-2-1) Speech (is merged in mind on account of observation and the scriptural statement).

According to Śaṅkara, the knower of the saguṇa Brahman travels after death by the path of the gods, The stages by which the soul passes out of the body at death are set forth in many texts. C.U. states

अस्य सोम्य पुरुषस्य प्रयतो वाङ्ङनसि संपद्यते, मनः प्राणे, प्राणस्तेजसि तेजः परस्यां देवतायाम्। (C.U. 6-8-6) When a man departs from hence, his speech merges into mind, his mind in his breath, his breath in fire, fire in the highest deity.

The question raised is whether it is the organ or the function that is merged and the answer is that it is the function. As mind is not the material cause of the organ, the organs cannot get merged in mind when a person departs from this life, speech is said to get merged in mind and so on. This merger is not of the things themselves, but only of their functions. Hence, that is which merger takes place need not be the material cause of what is merged.

Rāmānuja understands laya to mean not merging into but going forth in combination. As he observes, वाङ्मनसि सम्पद्यते इति वचनान्मनसा वाक्संयुज्यो न तु तत्र लीयते।

According to Madhva देवानां मोक्ष उत्क्रान्तिश्चास्मिन् पाद उच्यते। B. N. K. Sharma explains the statement in the following way. 'The predicative expression 'mokṣa' in this statement refers to the divestment of the body, and is to be read only with the word देवानाम् as its subject. The predicate उत्क्रान्ति similarly is to be read with adhikārins other than the devas supplied by the adhyāhāra. The reason for this split-up is that the devas have no utkrānti

1. Modi P. M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, pp. 344-345

from their final bodies through suṣumnānāḍī. They divest themselves of their bodies by entering into their higher-ups in the hierarchy and merging their bodies in those of their superiors. There is thus no possibility of their making an exit thro' their Brahmanaḍī which is utkrānti. As utkrānti in its technical sense is not applicable to the gods, it is to be confined only to the human souls. That being so, the expression mokṣa in the statement of the padārtha has naturally to be understood in the sense of divestment of the body. Ghate is thus definitely off the mark when he translates mokṣa in the above statement of Madhva as 'liberation' and ascribing 'utkrānti' to the gods also'.[1]

This adhikaraṇa establishes merger of the deity of vāk into the deity of the mind, Madhva also refers to the C.U. text referred to by Śaṅkara. Of course, Ghate refers to

Madhva in the context of these sūtras is as fantastic as ever.[2]

For Vallabha, the adhikaraṇa is of the four sūtras. Vallabha also refers to the same passage but, according to him, speech gets merged into the mind, with a view to talking with the Lord.

According to P. M. Modi, the adhikaraṇa should consist of 11 sūtras. He cites several śruti passages one of which is quoted by Śaṅkara and others.[3]

There should not be any doubt regarding the v.v. of the sūtra and adhikaraṇa, as it deals with the question of merger of the senses.

The second sūtra is अत एव च सर्वाण्यनु। (4-2-2) And for the same reason all (sense-organs follow) after.

All other sense-organs follow i.e. get merged in mind. P.U. states . तस्मादुपशान्ततेजाः। पुनर्भवमिन्द्रियैर्मनसि संपद्यमानैः। (P.U. 3-9) Therefore, he whose light has gone out comes to a new birth with his senses, merged in the mind.

Rāmānuja refers to the same P.U. śruti referred to by Śaṅkara.

According to Madhva, other gods also get merged.

---

1. Sharma B.N.K.,: The Brahmasūtra and Their Principal Commentaries, Vol.III, p. 645
2. Ghate V.S., Vedānta, p. 138
3. Modi P. M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, p. 348

According to Vallabha also, after the speech, all other senseorgans get merged into mind.

P. M. Modi's explanation is substantially the same as that of Śaṅkara.[1]

Manodhikaraṇam (4-2-3)

This is a one-sūtra-adhikaraṇa. The sūtra is तन्मनः प्राण उत्तरात्। (4-2-3) That mind (is merged) in life owing to the subsequent (statement). Here also, it is the function that gets merged, for we find that mind ceases to function in a dying man even while his vital force or prāṇa is functioning. Śaṅkara takes v.v. facitly the subsequent statement in the C.U. (6-15-1).

According to Rāmānuja, as in the previous sūtra, the mind is here said to be united with the vital breath.

According to Madhva, this adhikaraṇa establishes the layas of the deities of the mind viz. शेष and सुपर्ण in the deity of प्राण i.e. Hiraṇyagarbha, through vāṇī. He quotes from the

Kauṇḍinya Śruti, वायोवां रुद्र उदेति वायौ विलीयते तस्मादाहुः, वायुर्वै देवानां श्रेष्ठः। Rudra arises from Vāyu and get dissolved into Vāyu. Therefore, Vāyu indeed is the best of the gods.

According to Vallabha, mind along with other senses gets merged into the life or vital air.

According to P. M. Modi like, Śaṅkara उत्तरात् has a reference to मनः प्राणे which follows वाङ्मनसि संपद्यते। in C.U. 6-15-2.[2]

Adhyakṣādhikaraṇam (4-2-4 to 6)

The adhikaraṇa has the following three sūtras viz.

(i) सोऽध्यक्षे तदुपगमादिभ्यः। (4-2-4)

(ii) भूतेषु तच्छ्रुतेः। (4-2-5)

(iii) नैकस्मिन्दर्शयतो हि। (4-2-6)

The first sūtra is सोऽध्यक्षे तदुपगमादिभ्यः (4-2-4) That is the ruler on account of (statement indicating) approach and so on.

Prāṇa into which the different organs are merged has its abode in the individual soul. एवमेवमेवमात्मानमन्तकाले सर्वे प्राणा अभिसमायन्ति यत्रैतदूर्ध्वोच्छ्वासी भवति। (B.U. 4-3-38).

---

1. Modi P. M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, pp. 350-351
2. Ibid., p. 352

All the prāṇas go to the self at the time of death when a man is thus going to expire. Again तमुत्क्रामन्तं प्राणोऽनूत्क्रामति।

After him, thus departing the prāṇa departs. And again प्राणमनूत्क्रामन्तं सर्वे प्राणा अनूत्क्रामन्ति। (B.U. 4-4-2)

And after the prāṇa thus, departing all the other prāṇas (senses) depart.

Rāmānuja holds that the life-principle is connected with the individual soul.

According to Madhva, the adhikaraṇa establishes the layas of prāṇa in the supreme Brahman which is designated as अध्यक्ष. According to Vallabha, prāṇa gets merged into the Lord when the Lord accepts the jīva.

P.M. Modi's explanation is similar to that of Śaṅkara.[1]

The second sūtra is भूतेषु तच्छ्रुतेः। (4-2-5) In the elements (the soul with the life principle is merged) as is seen in the scriptures.

The soul with the life-principle takes its abode in the five essence of the gross elements fire etc. which constitute the seed of the human body.

The life principle is said to be united with fire in C.U. प्राणस्तेजसि (C.U. 6-8-6). It means the elements together with fire on account of scriptural declaration to that पृथिवीमयः आपोमयः तेजोमयः।

Rāmānuja also explains the sūtra in the same way.

According to Madhva, the laya is of the deities other than abhimāni devatās into their sources. The deities of the earth and ether merge in Vāyu through Bṛhaspati, the deity of the elemental air, through Indra and of the waters through Soma.

With this sūtra, Vallabha begins a new adhikaraṇa of the two sūtras. According to him, of the devotees of the Maryādāmārga, speech etc. merge into the elements and not into the Lord. Śruti also states

यत्रास्य पुरुषस्य मृतस्याग्निं वागप्येति वातं प्राणश्चक्षुरादित्यं मनश्चन्द्रं लोहितं च रेतश्च निधीयते। (B.U. 3-3-13)

When the speech (voice) of this dead person enters into fire, the breath into air, the eye into the sun, the mind into the moon, hearing into the quarters, the self into the ether. the hairs of the

---

1. Modi P. M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, pp. 353-54

body into the herbs, the hairs on the head into the tress and the blood and semen are deposited into water. According to P.M. Modi, the sūtra refers to the Śruti

विज्ञानात्मा सह देवैश्च सर्वैः प्राणा भूतानि संप्रतिष्ठन्ति यत्र।
तदक्षरं वेदयते यस्तु सोम्य स सर्वज्ञः सर्वमेवाविशन्ति।। (P. U. 4-11)

He who knows the that Undecaying (self) in which are established the self of the nature of intelligence the vital breaths, and the elements along with all the gods (powers) becomes, O dear, Omniscient and enters all.[1] नैकस्मिन्दर्शयतो हि। (4-2-6) Not in one (element) only (the soul goes) for both question and answer declare this. At the time of death, when the soul leaves one body and goes in for another, it together with the subtle body resides in the subtle essence of all the gross elements and not in that of fire only for all the elements are required for a future body. Śruti states पृथिवीमय आपोमयो वायुमय आकाशमयस्तेजोमयः। (B.U. 4-4-5) Consisting of earth, water, wind, ether, heat. Smṛti also states अण्व्यो मात्रा विनाशिन्यो दशार्धानां तु याः स्मृताः।
ताभिः स्पर्धमिदं सर्वं संभवत्यनुपूर्वशः।। (Manusmṛti 1-2-11)

Earth, water, fire, air and ākāsa are said to be the five imperishable subtle elements of out of which all-these things are produced in succession.

Rāmānuja says that fire denotes fire mixed with the other elements, life-principle, and the souls are therefore united with the aggregate of the elements. Rāmānuja refers to the C.U. passage and the Smṛti Viṣṇupurāṇa.

अनेन जीवेनात्मनाऽनुप्रविश्य नामरूपे व्याकरवाणि तासां त्रिवृतं त्रिवृतमेकैकां करवाणि। (C.U. 6-3,2-3).

By means of the living self, let me develop, the name and forms, let me make each of the three threefold.

Rāmānuja quotes Viṣṇupurāṇa Smṛti

नानावीर्याः पृथग्भूताः ततस्ते संहतिं विना।
नाशक्नुवन् प्रजास्स्रष्टुमसमागम्य कृत्स्नशः॥
समेत्यान्योन्यसंयोगं परस्परसमाश्रयाः।
महदाद्या विशेषान्ता ह्यण्डमुत्पादयन्ति ते।। (Viṣṇupurāṇa 1-2-51-52)

1. Modi P. M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, pp. 354-355

Then they, possessing different powers, remaining separate, could not create people, without uniting together, not coming jointly as a whole.

Having attained to mutual union, resorting to one another, beginning with Mahat and ending with the particular (modification) they indeed create the egg.

According to Madhva, laya of all the other deities in Agni alone, is not to be accepted as śrutis themselves state

पृथिव्या ऋभवो देवा: विलीयन्ते वरुणोऽश्विनावञ्नावग्न्यो वाया

विन्द्र: सोम आदित्यो बृहस्पतिरित्याकाश एव साध्या विलीयन्ते ऋभव: पृथिव्यां वरुण आपोऽग्नयस्तेजसि मरुतो मारुत आकाशे विनायका विलीयन्ते। (महोपनिषच्चतुर्वेद शिखायाम्)।

Ṛbhus merge in the deity of earth, Aśvins in Varuṇa, the sons of Agni in Agni. Indra, Soma, Āditya, Bṛhaspati in Vāyu, Sādhyas in Ākāśa, Ṛbhus in Earth, Varuṇa, Waters, and Fires in Fire, Maruta in Māruta, and in Ākāśa, Garuda, merge.

According to Vallabha, the restriction of Maryādā mārga is applicable not only to jñānin or only to bhakta, but to both of them.

P.M. Modi has the following to say on the sūtra: एकस्मिन् means एकस्मिन्भूते. This expression is cleverly used by the Sūtrakāra, to refer to तेजस् and also water.... Śaṅkara gives also another explanation of दर्शयत: as दर्शयत: श्रुतिस्मृती (in addition to प्रश्नप्रतिवचने), but the Smṛti reference cannot be traced to the B. G. or the MBH.'[1] From what P.M. Modi says it appears that P. M. Modi is not in favour of explaning the sūtra as 'Śruti and Smṛti delcare so'. But in the translation of the sūtra, which is supposed to be according to the interpretation, he translates 'Not with one element because both the Śruti and Smṛti show it.[2]

Āsṛtyupakramādhikaraṇam (4-2-7)

This is a one-sūtra-adhikaraṇa. The sūtra is समाना चासृत्युपक्रमादमृतत्वं चानुपोष्य। 4-2-7) And common is the mode of departure for both the knower of Saguṇa Brahman and the ignorant upto the beginning of the way and the immortality (of him who knows) (is relative only) not having burnt (ignorance).

---

1. Modi P. M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, pp. 355-356
2. Ibid., p. 347

According to Śaṅkara, for the knower of the Nirguṇa Brahman, there is no departure at all. The question is to be considered is whether the path to Brahmaloka to which the knower of Saguṇa Brahman goes and the path to the world in which the ignorant is reborn, are identical or different. The sūtra says that both go by the same way till the knower enters the suṣumnānāḍī and the ignorant some other vein. After that one goes by the path of the gods and the other by the path to have rebirth. Till they enter on their respective ways, the mode of departure is the same.

For Rāmānuja, the adhikaraṇa extends upto 13 (7 to 13). Rāmānuja quotes from the B.U. तेन प्रद्योतेनैष आत्मा निष्क्रामति चक्षुषो वा मूर्घ्नो वा अन्येभ्यो वा शरीरदेशेभ्य इति। (B.U. 6-4-2) and explains that the immortality which is ascribed to the knower as soon as he shakes off all desires can only mean the destruction of the effect of good and evil works and the reaching of Brahman means the intuition of Brahman granted to the meditating devotee. C.U. states

शतं चैका च हृदयस्य नाडयस्तासां मूर्धानमभिनिस्सृतैका। तयोर्ध्वमायन्नमृतत्वमेति विष्वङ्ङन्या उत्क्रमणे भवन्ति। (C.U. 8-6-6) 'A hundred and one are the arteries of the heart, one of them leads upto the crown of the head. Going upward through that, one becomes immortal, the others serve for going in various other directions.

As the soul of the knower is said to pass out by way of a particular vein, upto the soul's outering the vein, there is no difference between the knower and the non-knower.

Thus Rāmānuja's explanation is same as that of Śaṅkara.

Only Rāmānuja does not distinguish between सगुणब्रह्मज्ञानी and निर्गुणब्रह्मज्ञानी.

Though Śaṅkara does not quote any Śruti, he suggests the v.v. by the words ज्ञानप्रकाशितं मोक्षनाडीद्वारम् but the passages quoted by Rāmānuja could very well have been the v.v. of the sūtra.

Saṁsāravyapadeśādhikaraṇam (4-2-8 to 11)

The adhikaraṇa has the following four sūtras.

(i) तदाऽऽपीतेः संसारव्यपदेशात्। (4-2-8)

(ii) सूक्ष्मं प्रमाणतश्च तथोपलब्धेः। (4-2-9)

(iii) नोपमर्देनातः। (4-2-10)

(iv) अस्यैव चोपपत्तेरेष उष्मा। (4-2-11)

The First sūtra is तदाऽऽपीतेः संसारव्यपदेशात्। (4-2-8) That (subtle body continues) upto the attainment of Brahman on account of the declarations of the empirical state (made by scripture).

The merging cannot be absolute for then all would attain liberation. It is the kind of mergence that we experience in deep sleep. Only the functions of the elements are merged and not the elements themselves. The final dissolution does not take place until knowledge is attained. Till then, the scriptures declare that the individual soul is subject to empirical existence. योनिमन्ये प्रपद्यन्ते शरीरत्वाय देहिनः। स्थाणुमन्येऽनुसंयान्ति यथाकर्म यथाश्रुतम्।। (Kaṭha U. 5-7)

Some enter the womb, for embodied existence as organic beings, others go into inorganic matter, according to their work and according to their knowledge.

Rāmānuja refers to the mention of immortality in the previous sūtra and states that it does not imply the separation of the soul from the body because the Śruti तस्य तावदेव चिरं यावन्न विमोक्ष्येऽथ संपत्स्ये। (C.U. 6-14-2) declares that Saṁsāra is upto the reaching of Brahman (For him there is delay so long as he is not delivered, then he will be one with Brahman).

Madhva explains the sūtra with reference to Prakṛti.

For Vallabha, the sūtra points out one more difference between the devotee of the Maryādāmārga and that of the Puṣṭimārga. Liberation of Maryādāmārgin is as good as Saṁsāra because it does not have the pleasure of singing the Lord's praises.

The second sūtra is सूक्ष्मं प्रमाणतश्च तथोपलब्धेः। (4-2-9) And that is subtle in size, it is so experienced.

The body in which the soul abides at the time of death is subtle in nature and size. This is understood from the scriptural statements which declare that it goes out along the nāḍīs.

Rāmānuja states that the bondage of the knower is not dissolved for the reason that the subtle body continues to persist. Kau. U. says to this effect ब्रह्मा पृच्छति कोऽसीति। तं प्रति ब्रूयात्। Brahmā asks jiva 'Who are you?' He should reply to him.

According to Madhva, this sūtra refers to the difference of nature between Brahman and prakṛti.

According to Vallabha, the essence of the puṣṭimārga is very subtle and it is so because of the veryfying means of the Śruti. यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते अप्राप्य मनसा सह। आनन्दं ब्रह्मणो विद्वान् न बिभेति कुतश्चन्। (T.U. 2-9) Without attaining, along with mind the speeches return. One who knows Brahman as joy has no fear from any source.

P.M. Modi concurs with Śaṅkara. The third sūtra is नोपमर्देनात:। (4-2-10) Therefore (this subtle body) is not (destroyed) by the destruction (of the gross body). The subtle body is not destroyed by what destroys the gross body burning etc.

Rāmānuja says that immortality is not effected by means of the total destruction of the body, He quotes from the Kaṭha U.

यदा सर्वे प्रमुच्यन्ते कामा येऽस्य हृदि स्थिता:। (Kaṭha U. 2-3-14)

When all desires that dwell within the human heart are cast away, then a mortal becomes immortal and here, he attains Brahman.

According to Madhva, the sūtra points out that Prakṛti enjoys a modicum of equality or parity with Brahman without detriment to the supreme independence and other sovereign attributes of Brahman which Prakṛti does not share with Brahman.

Vallabha continues to explain the sūtra from the bhakti point of view.

P.M. Modi, agrees with Śaṅkara.[1]

Rāmānuja's passage is of a too general nature to be considered the v.v. of the sūtra, as the context is of the retention of the subtle body.

The last sūtra is अस्यैव चोपपत्तेरेष ऊष्मा। (4-2-11) And to this (subtle body) alone, does this (bodily) warmth belong, because this (only) is possible.

The bodily warmth observed in living animals belong to this subtle body and not to the gross body for the warmth is felt so long as there is life and not after that.

Rāmānuja also explains the sūtra in the same way.

Madhva quotes from some Sauparṇa Śruti which describes the orders of sentient beings, the Uṣmāvat and anuṣmāvat. Of these Brahman is one possessed of Uṣmā, the power to remain

1. Modi P. M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, p. 362

inaccessible to the senses of smell, hearing, perception, and so on of others.

According to Vallabha, burning arising out of separation is also full of joy as that is the logical thing.

P. M. Modi follows Śaṅkara in the main.[1]

Pratiṣedhādhikaraṇam (4-2-12- to 14). The adhikaraṇa has the following three sūtras viz.

(i) प्रतिषेधादिति चेन्न शारीरात्। (4-2-12)

(ii) स्पष्टो ह्येकेषाम्। (4-2-13)

(iii) स्मर्यते च। (4-2-14)

The first sūtra is प्रतिषेधादिति चेन्न शारीरात्। (4-2-12) If it be said that on account of the denial (made by the scripture) (the life-principles of a knower of Brahman do not depart) (we say that it is) not so, (because scripture says that life-principles do not depart) from the embodied soul. B.U. says अथाकामयमानो योऽकामो निष्काम आप्तकाम आप्तकामो भवति, न तस्य प्राणा उत्क्रामन्ति ब्रह्मैव सन्ब्रह्माप्येति (B.U. 4-4-6). But as to the man who does not desire, who not desiring freed from desires, is satisfied in his desires, or desires the self only of him is that spirits do not depart; being Brahman, he goes to Brahman.

From this clear denial, it follows that the Prāṇas do not pass out of the body of him who knows Brahman. The pūrvapakṣa argues that the passage does not deny the passage of the prāṇas from the body but only from the embodied soul. For if they i.e. prāṇas do not depart from the body, there will be no death at all.

For Rāmānuja, as noted earlier, the sūtra is a part of the previous adhikaraṇa. According to Rāmānuja, Prāṇas do not depart in the sense that, they accompany to go on the path of the gods.

For Madhva, question of parity or equality between prakṛti and Brahman continues hereas in this sūtra.

Vallabha quotes the C.U. न पश्यो मृत्युं पश्यति न रोगं नोत दुःखताम्। (C.U. 7-2-6-2) One who has perceived Him does not see death, decease nor misery state. The passage denies misery. But the denial is of body and not of the विरहताप.

---

1. Modi P. M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, p. 362

The next sūtra is स्पष्टो ह्येकेषाम्। (4-2-13) For (the denial of the departure) is clear (in the texts of some schools).

The sūtra refutes the view of the previous sūtra, by connecting the denial of the departure from the body and not from the soul. That the prāṇas do not depart from the body is clear from B.U. यत्रायं पुरुषो म्रियत उदस्मात्प्राणाः क्रामन्त्याहो नेति। नेति होवाच याज्ञवल्क्यः। (B.U. 3-2-11) When this man dies, do the vital spirits depart from him or not? No, replied Yājñavalkya. It is not true that if the prāṇas do not depart, there will be no death, for they do not remain in the body but get merged which makes life impossible and we say that the person is dead. Again if prāṇas departed with the soul from the body, then the rebirth of the soul would be inevitable and there would be no liberation. So the prāṇas do not depart from the body in the case of a knower of Brahman.

Though Rāmānuja has taken this sūtra as a part of the previous sūtra, his way of explaining the sūtra is same as that of Śaṅkara, quoting the same passages.

Madhva continues the explaining the nature of Prakṛti.

Vallabha explains the sūtra from the bhakti point of view.

According to P. M. Modi, Śaṅkara shoud not have referred to the माध्यन्दिन text in the sūtra 12. That he should have done it here.[1]

The last sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is स्मर्यते च। (4-2-14) And the Smṛti also says so. In the MBH, it is stated

सर्वभूतात्मभूतस्य सम्यग्भूतानि पश्यतः।
देवा अपि मार्गे मुह्यन्त्यपदस्य पदैषिणः॥

He who has become the self of all beings and has a complete intuition of all beings as his own self, the gods themselves are perplexed seeking for the path of him who has no path.

It follows from this that he who knows Brahman neither moves nor departs.

Rāmānuja says that there are Smṛti passages which declare that the sage departs by the means of an artery from the head. Rāmānuja quotes Yājñavalkya Smṛti.

---

1. Modi P. M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, pp. 366-367

उर्ध्वमेकः स्थितः तेषां यो भित्त्वा सूर्यमण्डलम्। (3-16)

ब्रह्मलोकमतिक्रम्य तेन याति परां गतिम्।। (3-16)

Of those one is situated above which pierces the disc of the sun and passes beyond the world of Brahma, by way of that, the soul reaches the highest goal.

For Madhva, the sūtra discusses prakṛti.

According to P. M. Modi.[1] the Smṛti would be the B.G.

सर्वद्वाराणि संयम्य मनो हृदि निरुध्य च।

मूर्ध्न्याधायात्मनः प्राणमास्थितो योगधारणाम्।।

ओमित्येकाक्षरं ब्रह्म व्याहरन्मामनुस्मरन्।

यः प्रयाति त्यजन्देहं स यातीति परमां गतिम्।। (B. G. 8-12, 15)

If, when a man leaves his earthly body, he is in the silence of Yoga, and closing the doors of the soul, he keeps the mind in his heart, and places in the head the breath of life.

And remembering me, he utters OM, the eternal word of Brahman, he goes to the path supreme.[2]

Vāgādilayādhikaraṇam (4-2-15)

This is a One-sūtra-adhikaraṇa. The sūtra is तानि परे तथा ह्याह 4-2-15). Those elements etc.) (are merged) in the Highest Brahman for thus (the scripture) says.

The question is in regard to the knower of Brahman who dies. What happens to the sense-organs and the subtle body in which they abide? These get merged in the Supreme Brahman. P.U. says एवमेवास्य परिद्रष्टुरिमाः षोडशकलाः पुरुषायणाः पुरुषं प्राप्यास्तं गच्छन्ति। (P.U. 6-5) Thus these sixteen parts of the spectator that go towards the person when they have reached the person, sink into him. Thus the whole aggregate gets merged into Brahman.

Rāmānuja says that the elements unite themselves with the Highest Self. वाङ्मनसि सम्पद्यते। (C.U. 6-8-6) etc. Speech gets disssolved into mind and so on.

Madhva quotes some Kausarava Śruti.

Vallabha explains the sūtra from the bhakti point of view, Vallabha quotes Ṛgveda

---

1. Modi P. M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part-I, pp. 368-369
2. Translation by Juan Mascaro,: The Bhagavadgītā, Published by Penguin Books, Reprint 1973.

ता वां वास्तून्युष्मसि गमध्यै यत्र गावो भूरिशृङ्गाः अयासः।
अत्राह तदुरुगायस्य वृष्णः परमं पदमवभाति भूरि॥

We seek to obtain from you two those things where good cows with many horns dwell and the place of Him sung wide shines much and bestows wishes.

For P.M. Modi तथा ह्याह refers to तेजः परस्यां देवतायाम्। (C.U. 6-15-2) and कर्माणि विज्ञानमयश्च आत्मा परेऽव्यये सर्व एकीभवन्ति। (M.U. 3-2-7).

According to P. M. Modi, Śaṅkara does not refer to those Śrutis which mention the उत्क्रान्ति process and in which it is stated that the soul with the subtle elements unites with the supreme one in the heart at the time of departure from the body.[1]

Avibhāgādhikaraṇam (4-2-16)

This is also a one-sūtra-adhikaraṇa. The sūtra is अविभागो वचनात्। (4-2-16) (There is) non-distinction from Brahman of the parts merged in it according to scriptural statement. The text here considered is from the P. U. भिद्यते तासां नामरूपे पुरुष इत्येवं प्रोच्यते स एषोऽकलोऽमृतो भवति। (P. U. 6-5)

Their name and form are broken and people speak of the person only, and he becomes without parts and immortal.

Rāmānuja says that the union is non-division i.e. connection of such a kind that the subtle elements are incapable of being thought of or spoken of as separate from Brahman.

According to Madhva, the sūtra states that devas are completely dependent on Brahman; in mokṣa. This does not come into contradiction with the Śrutis which describe them in release as Satyakāma or Satyasaṁkalpa. What is meant by these statements is that the devas in mokṣa, are so in the sense that their thoughts and desires are perfectly attuned to those of Brahman. Madhva quotes from the T. A. कामेन मे काम आगात् हृदयात् हृदयं मृत्योः। (T. A. 3-15-4) My desire has proceeded from the desire of the Lord, the destroyer of all my will from His.

Vallabha continues the discussion of the bhakti point of view. According to Vallabha, there is no separation for a devotee of the puṣṭimārga from the sport of the Lord as there is a promise. विष्णोः कर्माणि पश्यत। (T. S. 1-3-6) watch the deeds of Viṣṇu. Again तद्विष्णोः

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, pp. 371-72

परमं पदं सदा पश्यन्ति सूरयः। (T. S. 1-3-6) Sages watch the highest abode of Viṣṇu always.

According to P. M. Modi, वचनात् means that the sūtrakāra refers to a Śruti in which अविभाग is expressly mentioned. Such a Śruti is B.U. 4-3-23 viz. यद्वै तन्न पश्यति पश्यन्वै तन्न पश्यति न हि द्रष्टुर्दष्टेर्विपरिलोपो विद्यते विनाशित्वान्न तु तद्वितीयमस्ति ततोऽन्यद्विभक्तं यत्पश्येत् (B.U. 4-3-23 to 30)[1] Verily, when there (in the state of deep sleep) he does not see, he is verily seeing, though he does not see for there is no cessation of the seeing of a seer, because of the imperishability (of the seer). There is not however a second, nothing else separate from him that he could see.

It may be noted that, Śaṅkara is going to quote this Śruti on an exactly similar occasion i.e. when he comes to discuss अविभागेन दृष्टत्वात्। (B. S. 4-4-4).

Tadokodhikaraṇam (4-2-17)

This is a one-sūtra-adhikaraṇa. The sūtra is तदोकोग्रज्वलनं तत्प्रकाशितद्वारो विद्यासामर्थ्यात्तच्छेषगत्यनुस्मृतियोगाच्च हार्दनुगृहीतः शताधिकया। (4-2-17) (When the soul of the knower of saguṇa Brahman is about to depart from the body, there takes place) a lighting up of the top of its (the soul's) abode (the heart). With the passage (for the departure of soul) being illuminated thereby (the soul departs being favoured by him (Brahman) who resides in the heart, along with that nāḍī which is beyond the hundred (i.e. suṣumnā) owing to the power of knowledge and the appropriateness of his constant meditation on the way which is part of that knowledge. The passage from the B.U. is considered स एतास्तेजोमात्राः समभ्याददानो हृदयमेवान्ववक्रामति। (B.U. 4-4-1) He taking with him those elements of light descends into the heart तस्य हैतस्य हृदयस्याग्रं प्रद्योतते तेन प्रद्योतेनैष आत्मा निष्क्रामति चक्षुष्टो वा मूर्ध्नो वाऽन्येभ्यो वा शरीरदेशेभ्यः। (B.U. 4-4-2)

The point of his heart becomes lighted up and by that light, the self departs either through the eye or through the skull or through other places of the body.

These texts indicate that, at the time of death, the soul together with the organs come to the heart. For both the knower

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, pp. 376-77

and ignorant the point of the heart becomes shining and the passage of exit is also thereby lighted up. But the knower departs through the skull only while the others depart from other places, as C.U. states शतं चैका च हृदयस्य नाड्यस्तासां मूर्धानमभिनिःसृतैका। तयोरुर्ध्वमायन्नमृतत्वमेति विष्वङङन्या उत्क्रमणे भवन्ति। (C.U. 8-6-6) There are a hundred and one veins of the hearts, one of them penetrates the top of the head, by that moving upwards a man reaches immortality the others serve for departing in different directions.

Rāmānuja takes the sūtra as applicable to the knower. The knower wins the favour of the supreme person who abides within the heart and is assisted by him.

Madhva begins a fresh adhikaraṇa lasting upto the end (17-21) of the pāda. According to him, the sūtra says that the jñānin's death stands very much distinguished from that of an ordinary mortal, Madhva quotes the same passage referred to by Śaṅkara.

According to Vallabha, the sūtra deals with the Maryādāmārgin. The maryādāmārgin departs by the 101st nāḍī and not by any other nāḍī.

For P. M. Modi, the v.v. is the same referred to by Śaṅkara.[1]

Raśmyadhikaraṇam (4-2-18,19)

The adhikaraṇa has got two sūtras viz.

(i) रश्म्यनुसारी। (4-2-18)

(ii) निशि नेति चेन्न संबन्धस्य यावद्देहभावित्वाद्दर्शयति। (4-2-19)

The first sūtra is रश्म्यनुसारी (4-2-18) (The soul after departing from the body) follows the rays. C.U. states

अथ यददिमस्मिन् ब्रह्मपुरे दहरं पुण्डरीकं वेश्म... (C.U. 8-1-1)

अथ या एता हृदयस्य नाडयः। (C.U. 8-6-1) अथ यैतदस्माच्छरीरादत्क्रमत्यथैतैरेव रश्मिभिरुर्ध्वमाक्रमते। (C.U. 8-6-5) तयोर्ध्वमायन्नमृतत्वमेति (C.U. 8-6-6). There is this city of Brahman, and in it the palace, the small lotus and in it the small ether.

Now these arteries of the heart. When he departs from this body, he departs upwards by these very rays.

By that moving upwards, he reaches immortality.

From these passages we learn that the soul of the knower of Saguṇa Brahman, after departing from the body along the

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, p. 379

suṣumnā, follows the rays of the Sun. Whether it departs in day ar night, it follows the rays which exist both in day and night.

Rāmānuja takes the adhikaraṇa as consisting of only one sūtra, Rāmānuja also considers the same C.U. passage.

Madhva explains the sūtra in this way. There is no darkness inside the nāḍī at the time of the jñānin's exist as in the case of the ajñānin. There are rays present in the nāḍis and jñānin with the help of the rays makes his exist through the former.

According to Vallabha also the knower follows the rays. This is applicable to the maryādāmārgin.

For P.M. Modi, the sūtra has a reference to अथ यत्रैतदस्माच्छरीरादुत्क्रामत्यथैतैरेव रश्मिभिरुर्ध्वमाक्रमते स ओमिति होद्वामीयते स यावत्क्षिप्येन्मनस्तावदादित्यं गच्छत्येतद्वै खलु लोकद्वारं विदुषां प्रपदनं निरोधोऽविदुषाम्। (C.U. 8-6-5)[1]

But when he thus departs from this body, then he goes upwards by these very rays or he goes up with the thought of Aum. As his mind is failing he goes to the suns. That, verily, is the gateway of the world, an entering in for the knowers as shutting out for the non-knowers.

The next sūtra is निशि नेति चेन्न संबन्धस्य यावद्देहभावित्वाद्दर्शयति च। (4-2-19) If it be said (that the soul does) not (follow the rays) in the night (we reply that it is) not so, because, the connection of (the nāḍīs and the rays) continues as long as the body lasts, and (scripture) also declares this.

The connection lasts as long as the body lasts. So it is immaterial whether the soul passes out in day or in night. The sun's rays continue even in night. The result of knowledge cannot be made to depend on the accident of death by day or by night. C.U. states अमुष्मादादित्यात्प्रतायन्ते ता आसु नाडीषु सृप्ता आभ्यो नाडीभ्यः प्रतायन्ते तेऽमुष्मिन्नादित्ये सृप्ताः। (C.U. 8-6-2)

स यावत्क्षिप्येन्मनस्तावदादित्यं गच्छति। (C.U. 8-6-5) They (rays) stretch out from younder sun and slip into these veins, they stretch from these veins and slip into the younder sun.

As quickly as he sends off the mind, he goes to the Sun, Rāmānuja explains the sūtra in the same way as that of Śaṅkara.

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, p. 384

Madhva splits the sūtra into two viz. निशि नेति चेन्न सम्बन्धात्। (4-2-19) सम्बन्धात्। (4-2-19) यावद्देहभावित्वाद्दर्शयति च। (4-2-20)

Madhava also explains that during night also, there also remaining a connection with the rays.

Vallabha explains the sūtra as saying that if it be said that at night, the knower does not depart. Then it is said that the connection lasts so long as the body lasts, and hence, the time is not important. Thus it is said by the the Śruti एतमेव विदित्वा मुनिर्भवत्येतमेव प्रव्राजिनो लोकमीप्सन्तः प्रव्रजन्ति। (B.U. 4-4-22) On knowing him, in truth, one becomes an ascetic. Desiring him only as their worlds, monks wander forth.

According to P. M. Modi, the v. v. of Śaṅkara is not a proper one.[1] According to him, the Śruti intended by the Sūtrakāra is य एष एतस्मिन्मण्डले पुरुषो यश्चायं दक्षिणेऽक्षन्पुरुषस्तावेतावन्योऽन्यस्मिन्प्रतिष्ठितौ रश्मिभिरेषोऽस्मिन् प्रतिष्ठितः प्राणैरयममुष्मिन् स यदोत्क्रमिष्यन् भवति शुद्धमेवैतन्मण्डलं पश्यति नैनमेते रश्मयः प्रत्यायन्ति। (B.U. 5-5-2)

The person who is there in that orb and the person who is here in the right eye, these two rest on each other. Though his rays that one rests in this one; through the vital breaths this one on that when one is about to depart, he sees that orb as clear. Those rays no more come to him.

Dakṣiṇāyanādhikaraṇam (4-2-20, 21)

The last adhikaraṇa of this pāda has two sūtras–

(i) अतश्चायनेऽपि दक्षिणे। (4-2-20)

(ii) योगिनः प्रति च स्मर्यते स्मार्ते चैते। (4-2-21)

The first sūtra is अतश्चायनेऽपि दक्षिणे। (4-2-20)

And for the same reason (the departing soul follows the rays) during the southern progress of the soul.

The objection is put forth that the soul of the knower of Brahman who passes away during the southern course of the sun does not follow the rays to Brahmaloka as both Śruti and Smṛti say that only one who dies during the northern course of the sun goes there. Besides, it is said that Bhīṣma waited for the northern course of the sun, to leave the body. The sūtra says that the result

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, pp. 384-85

of knowledge does not depend on the accident of passing in the Northern or the Southern course of the sun.

Rāmāṇuja, as in the previous sūtras, states that, the knower who died in the Southern course of the sun also, does attain Brahma. The same reason is applicable to a knower dead during the night.

Madhva also takes the sūtra as meaning that the time is not important to a knower.

Vallabha also explains the sūtra in a similar fashion. According to P. M. Modi, 'it is not the follower of the Śruti who is the opponent here: The opponent is a स्मार्त वेदान्तिन् a follower of the Gītā.'[1]

The last sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is योगिन: प्रति च स्मर्यते स्मार्ते चैते। (4-2-21) (These details) are stated in the Smṛti with reference to the Yogins and both (Sāṁkhya and Yoga) are smṛti only.

S.G. states -

अग्निज्योतिरह: शुक्ल: षण्मासा उत्तरायणम्।

धूमो रात्रिस्तथा कृष्ण: षण्मासा दक्षिणायनम्।। (B.G. 8-24-25)

Fire, light, the day, the bright half of the month, the six months of the northern progress, smoke, night, the dark half of the month, the six months of the southern progress.

But these are Smṛtis and not Śrutis. The limitations do not apply to those who pursue the path of knowledge described in the Śruti texts.

Rāmānuja says that the time mentioned indicates the gods who lead the jīva.

According to Madhva also, the sūtra states that in the case of the jñānin, no disadvantage attaches to death in the night or in the dark fortnight or in Dakṣiṇāyana as the rays permeate the nāḍīs throughout life.

According to Vallabha, the particular time is stated with reference to a Yogin and not to a jñānamārgin.

P. M. Modi concurs with Śaṅkara.[2]

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, p. 385
2. Ibid., pp. 385-387

CHAPTER - 10

VIṢAYAVĀKYAS IN THE THIRD AND FOURTH PĀDA OF THE PHALĀDHYĀYA:

Arcirādyadhikaraṇam (4-3-1)

This is a one-sūtra-adhikaraṇa. The sūtra is अर्चिरादिना तत्प्रथितेः। (4-3-1) (On the road beginning with light, (the departed soul proceeds) on account of that being widely known. There are different declarations about the path of the gods - (devayāna) leading to Brahmaloka. अथैतैरेव रश्मिभिरूर्ध्वम् आक्रमते। (C.U. 8-6-5) Then he mounts upwards by just those rays. तेऽर्चिषमभिसंभवन्त्यर्चिषोऽहः। (C.U. 5-10-1) They go to the light, from light to day. स एतं देवयानं पन्थानमासाद्याग्निलोकमागच्छति। (Kau.U. 1-3) Having reached the path of the gods, he comes to the world of Agni. यदा वै पुरुषोऽस्माल्लोकात्प्रैति स वायुमागच्छति। (B.U. 5-10-1) When a person goes away from this world, he comes to the wind, सूर्यद्वारेण ते विरजाः प्रयान्ति। (M.U. 1-2-11) Free from passions, they depart through the gate of the sun.

The question is whether these texts refer to different paths or are different descriptions of the same path. The sūtra says that they give different descriptions of the same path. ते तेषु ब्रह्मलोकेषु पराः परावतो वसन्ति। (B.U.6-2-15)

In these worlds of Brahman, they dwell for ever and ever. तस्मिन्वसति शाश्वतीः समाः। (B.U. 5-10-1) There he dwells eternal years. सा या ब्रह्मणो जितिर्या व्युष्टिस्तां जितिं जयति तां व्युष्टिं व्यश्नुते। (Kau. 1-4) Whatever, victory, whatover greatness belongs to Brahman, that victory he gives, that greatness he reaches. तद्य एवैतं ब्रह्मलोकं ब्रह्मचर्येणानुविन्दति। (C.U. 8-4-3) Those who find the world Brahman by Brahmacarya, the goal attained is the same in all cases.

Rāmānuja, Madhva and Vallabha explain the sūtra in the same way. Vallabha makes the sūtra applicable to a follower of maryādāmārga. For Vallabha, the adhikaraṇa consists of four sūtras (1-4).

P.M. Modi observes, 'The ray of sūtra (4-2-18) (रश्म्यनुसारी) is the same as the flame (अर्चिः) of this sūtra, Both the words mean 'a ray 'and here, it means the rays of the sun. The word अर्चिः occurs

in the v.v. The sūtrakāra seems to accept C.U. 4-15-5,6, 5-10-12 and B.U. 6-12-15 as the most well-known passages and in sūtras 2-3, he locates the worlds mentioned in passages other than these.'[1]

The passages which describe the path to gods could, very well, be the v.v.s of the sūtra.

Vāyvadhikaraṇam (4-3-2)

This is also a one-sūtra-adhikaraṇa. The sūtra is वायुमब्दादविशेषविशेषाभ्याम्। (4-3-2) From the year to air, on account of the absence and presence of specification. These are two texts indicating the stations. The passage from the C.U. is तेऽर्चिषमेवाभिसंभवन्त्यर्चिषोऽहरह्नः आपूर्यमाणपक्षमापूर्यमाणपक्षाद्यान्षडुदङ्ङेति मासांस्तान् मासेभ्यः संवत्सरं संवत्सरादादित्यम्। (C.U. 5-10-2) They go to the light, from light to day from day to the waxing half of the moon, from the waxing half of the moon, to the six months, when the sun goes to the north, from those months to the year, from the year to Āditya. In this passage the station देवलोक is missing. In the passage from the B.U. the reference to year is absent. The passage is ते य एवमेतद्विदुर्ये चामी अरण्ये श्रद्धा सत्यमुपासते तेऽर्चिरभिसंभवन्ति। अर्चिषोऽहः। अह्नः आपूर्यमाणपक्षम्। आपूर्यमाणपक्षाद्यान्षण्मासानुदङ्ङादित्य इति। मासेभ्यो देवलोकम्। देवलोकादित्यम्। B.U. 6-2-15.

So in one passage, the station देवलोक is absent and in the other, the station 'year' is absent. Both the texts are authoritative and hence, both the stages are to be inserted and then the order of succession would be like this. First will come year after the months and then the देवलोक. Now what about Vāyu? For Vāyu there is specification and absence of specification both, in the śruti texts. B.U. states यदा वै पुरुषोऽस्माल्लोकोत्प्रैति स वायुमागच्छति तस्मै स तत्र विजिहीते यथा रथचक्रस्य खं तेन स उर्ध्वमाक्रमते स आदित्यमागच्छति। (B.U. 5-10-1)

When the person goes away from this world, he comes to Vāyu. Then Vāyu makes room for him like the hole of a wheel, and through it he mounts higher, he comes to Āditya. On account of the specification Vāyu is to come before Āditya. But in Kau.U.

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, pp. 389-390

स एतं देवयानं पन्थानमापद्याग्निलोकमागच्छति स वायुलोकं स वरुणलोकम्। (Kau.U. 1-3) Having reached the path of the gods he comes to the world of Agni, to the world of Vāyu. Here there is no specification about the succession.

Rāmānuja, Madhva and Vallabha explain the sūtra in the same way.

P.M. Modi observes, 'This हेतु seems to us to be applicable only to B.U. 5-10 therefore that śruti alone seems to be the v.v. and not Kau.U. 1-3...'[1] P.M. Modi queries, 'Why does the sūtrakāra use the word अब्द instead of संवत्सर which is found in the v.v.'s śruti?' The answer is very simple. The sūtrakāra has a penchant to use the synonym instead of the very word employed in a sūtra.

Taḍidadhikaraṇam (4-3-3)

This adhikaraṇa also has one sūtra i.e. तडितोऽधि वरुणः संबन्धात्। (4-3-3) After reaching the deity of lighting (the soul reaches) Varuṇa on account of the connection.

आदित्याच्चन्द्रमसं चन्द्रमसो विद्युतम्। (C.U. 4-15-5)

From Āditya to the moon, from the moon to lighting.

Obviously विद्युतम् is replaced by the word तडित् in the sūtra.

Now Kau.U. has mentioned the वरुणलोक. स एतं देवयानं पन्थानमापद्याग्निलोकमागच्छति स वायुर्लोकं स वरुणलोकं स इन्द्रलोकं स प्रजापतिलोकं स ब्रह्मलोकम्। (Kau.U. 1-3)

Having reached the path of the gods, he comes to the world of Agni, to the world of Vāyu, to the world of Varuṇa, to the world of Indra, to the world of Prajāpati, to the world of Brahman.

So from lighting, he goes to the world of Varuṇa.

Rāmānuja explains the sūtra in a similar fashion.

Madhva explains the sūtra as reconciling the śruti passages which he quotes as follows. The first passage is from the Kauṇḍinyaśruti. मासेभ्यः संवत्सरं संवत्सरात्वरुणलोकं वरुणलोकात् प्रजापतिलोकम्। From months to the Saṁvatsara to the world of Varuṇa, from Varuṇaloka to the world of Prajāpati.

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, pp. 392-393

Then there is a passage from some Gaupavana śruti.

संवत्सरात्तडितमागच्छति तडितः प्रजापतिलोकम्। From Saṁvatsara he goes to lightning, from lightning to the world of Prajāpati.

These śrutis quoted by Madhva are not traceable.

Vallabha explains the sūtra in the similar way like that of Śaṅkara.

Ātivāhikādhikaraṇam (4-3-4 to 6)

The adhikaraṇa has three sūtras viz.

(i) आतिवाहिकास्तल्लिङ्गात्। (4-3-4)

(ii) उभयव्यामोहात्तत्सिद्धेः। (4-3-5)

(iii) वैद्युतेनैव ततस्तच्छ्रुतेः। (4-3-6)

The first sūtra is आतिवाहिकास्तल्लिङ्गात् (4-3-4) (There are) deities conducting the soul (on the part of the gods) on account of the indicatory marks of that. These are not places of enjoyment but they are the deities of the places as C.U. चन्द्रमसो विद्युतं तत्पुरुषोऽमानवः स एतान्ब्रह्म गमयति। (C.U. 4-15-5) From the moon to the lightning, there is a person, that is not a man leads them to Brahman.[1]

Rāmānuja also explains the sūtra in the same way,

Madhva discusses the sentence from some śruti स इतो गतो द्वितीयां गतिं वायुं गच्छति। quoted in 4-3-2. Vāyu mentioned in the śruti, is ātivāhikavāyu and not the chief. For it is only a minor deity which can be fit to be reached in the earlier stages of the route.

Vallabha has an additional sūtra वरुणश्चाधीन्द्रप्रजापती। perhaps taking a cue from the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa वरुणादधीन्द्र प्रजापती, meaning above Varuṇaloka, there is the world of Indra and Prajāpati. The present sūtra is explained by Vallabha in the same way as Śaṅkara does. For Vallabha, ātivāhika means the servants of the God.

According to P.M. Modi, तल्लिङ्गात् refers to a definite śruti in which the rays etc. are distinctly said to be doing the work of a conductor. Very probably the following śruti is referred to तं नयन्त्येताः सूर्यस्य रश्मयो यत्र देवानां पतिरेकोधिवासः। (M.U. 1.2-5)[2] These

1. Refer to the chapter 3 for this predilection on the part of the sūtrakāra
2. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, p. 400

(offerings) in the form of the rays of the sun lead him to that (world) where the one lord of the gods abides.

The second sūtra is उभयव्यामोहात्तत्सिद्धेः। (4-3-5) This is established on the ground that both (the travellers and the deities of the path) are bewildered (unconcious). As the organs of the souls are withdrawn into the mind, they cannot guide themselves, light etc. being without intelligence cannot guide the souls. So intelligent deities guide the soul along the path to Brahmaloka.

Rāmānuja does not have this sūtra. Madhva explains the sūtra in this way: If there is a confusion between the chief Vāyu and the subordinate Vāyu, then it is to be the subordinate and not the chief as it is established in the śruti.

Vallabha explains that the God deludes both the types of devotees of Maryādamārga and Puṣṭimārga and then only the path's existence becomes meaningful.

The next sūtra is वैद्युतेनैव ततस्तच्छ्रुतेः। (4-3-6) From thence, (the souls are guided) by him only who belongs to the lightning that being known from the śruti. After they reach the deity identified with lightning, they are led by the very superhuman person who takes charge of them from the deity of lightning to Brahmaloka, through the worlds of Varuṇa, Indra and Prajāpati. तान्वैद्युतान्पुरुषो मानस एत्य ब्रह्मलोकान्गमयति। (B.U. 6-2-15) Then a person consisting (born) of mind goes to those regions of lightning and leads them to the worlds of Brahma.

Rāmānuja explains the sūtra in the same way.

According to Madhva, the adhikaraṇa says that mukhya prāṇa is the deity to be reached at the concluding stage of the jñānins route to Brahma after Utkrānti.

Vallabha explains that that person is related to Brahman and not resident of lightning because in the passage एत्य having come is used.

Karyādhikaraṇam (4-3-7 to 14)

The adhikaraṇa has the following 8 sūtras

(i) कार्यं बादरिरस्य गत्युपपत्तेः। (4-3-7)

(ii) विशेषितत्वाच्च। (4-3-8)

(iii) सामीप्यात्तु तद्व्यपदेशः। (4-3-9)

(iv) कार्यात्यये तदध्यक्षेण सहात: परमभिधानात्॥ (4-3-10)

(v) स्मृतेश्च। (4-3-11)

(vi) परं जैमिनिर्मुख्यत्वात्. (4-3-12)

(vii) दर्शनाच्च। (4-3-13)

(viii) न च कार्ये प्रतिपत्त्यभिसंधि:। (4-3-14)

The first sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is कार्यं बादरिरस्य गत्युपपत्ते:। (4-3-7) To the effected Brahman (the souls are led), so thinks Bādari, on account of the possibility of its being goal. In the sentence स एनान्ब्रह्म गमयति। (C.U. 4-15-5) He leads them to Brahman. The question is Is this saguṇa Brahman or nirguṇa Brahman? Bādri is of the opinion that saguṇa Brahman is meant for it occupies a place to which souls may go while nirguṇa Brahman is all-pervading.

For Rāmānuja the adhikaraṇa is of 10 sūtras. (7-16)

He takes the views of Bādari and Jaimini as two pūrvapakṣas which then are set aside and Bādarāyaṇa's opinion is accepted as the siddhānta. The question is: Which worshippers are taken to Brahman by the guides? Worshippers of Hiraṇyagarbha, or only the worshippers of the Highest Brahman, or worshippers of the Highest Brahman and the worshippers of the Pratyagātman with Brahman as the Antaryāmin? Bādari maintains that the guides lead the worshipper of Hiraṇyagarbha by the Devayāna path, for the worshipper of the Highest Brahman is not required to go anywhere. No movement can take place towards the Highest Brahman which is all-pervading and complete.

Madhva interprets the sūtra in the same way. Vallabha too explains the sūtra on the similar lines.

According to P.M. Modi, 'in the sūtra, we have no discussion of परब्रह्मण: गन्तव्यता or अगन्तव्यता. The only question is whether the conductor can go to परब्रह्मन् or to कार्य.'[1]

The second sūtra is विशेषितत्वाच्च (4-3-8) And on account (of Brahman to which the souls are led) being qualified. B.U. states ब्रह्मलोकान्गमयति ते तेषु ब्रह्मलोकेषु परा: परावतो वसन्ति। (B.U. 6-2-15) He leads them to the worlds of Brahman, they live for ever and ever. Plurality of the worlds is not possible with regard to the supreme Brahman. Saguṇa Branman may abide in different conditions.

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, pp. 408

Rāmānuja and Vallabha explain the sūtra in the same way.

Madhva quotes from some Kausaravaśruti.

According to P.M. Modi, Bādari seems to refer to the śrutis where प्रजापतिलोक and ब्रह्मलोक are distinguished and most probably to B.U. 3-6-1 (कस्मिन्नु खलु प्रजापतिलोका ओताश्च प्रोताश्चेति ब्रह्मलोकेषु गार्गीति कस्मिन्नु खलु ब्रह्मलोका ओताश्च प्रोताश्च इति स होवाच गार्गि मातिप्राक्षीर्मा ते मूर्धा व्यपप्तदनतिप्रश्न्यां वै देवतामतिपृच्छसि....)।

According to P.M. Modi ब्रह्मलोक is said to be देवता and the प्रजापतिलोक is traced to it.'[1] Now, P.M. Modi does not seem to be perspicuous here. Yājñavalkya, in the dialogue, seems to be suggesting that, one cannot go on ad infinitum for causation theory and nothing more. Most probably, Yajñavalkya does not wish to suggest that the Brahmaloka is the highest loka and identical with Brahman. So the way in which Śaṅkara has explained the sūtra, appears to be the correct way.

The third sūtra is सामीप्यात्तु तद्व्यपदेशः। (4-3-9) But on account of the proximity (to the higher Brahman), there is designation, (of the lower Brahman) as that. There is a proximity of the Higher Brahman to the lower Brahman and that is why it is called Brahman.

Rāmānuja says that Hiraṇyagarbha as the first created being stands nearer to Brahman and may, therefore, be described by the same term, Brahman.

Madhva and Vallabha explain the sūtra in the same way.

The next sūtra is कार्यात्यये तदध्यक्षेण सहातः परमभिधानात्। (4-3-10) On the passing away of the effected world (Brahmaloka) (the souls attain) together with the ruler of that world, what is higher than that (i.e. the Supreme Brahman) on account of scriptural declaration.

If the souls travelling by the path of the gods reach only the world of Hiraṇyagarbha, how can it be said that they will not return to the world, since there is no permanence apart from the Supreme Brahman? The sūtra explains that at the passing of the Brahmaloka, the souls which by that time, have attained knowledge along with Hiraṇyagarbha, attain the Highest Brahman.

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, pp. 409

Rāmānuja explains the sūtra in the same way. Madhva says that at the time of the mahāpralaya, the soul attains the Highest Brahman,

Vallabha also explains that, at the end of a Kalpa, the Brahmaloka gets destroyed and go along with the superintendent of that world, the soul goes to the Highest Brahman and then there is no return.

According to P.M. Modi, the śruti referred to by the sūtra probably is the following.[1]

वेदान्तविज्ञानसुनिश्चितार्थाः सन्न्यासयोगाद्यतयः शुद्धः सत्त्वाः। ते ब्रह्मलोकेषु परान्तकाले परामृताः परिमुच्यन्ति सर्वे।। (M.U. 3-2-6)

The ascetics who have ascertained well the meaning of the Vedānta knowledge, who have purified their natures through the path of renunciation, they (dwelling) in the worlds of Brahma, at the end of time, being one with the immortal, are all liberated.

According to P.M. Modi, 'This sūtra tells us how those who are carried by the conductor to कार्य or प्रजापतिलोक would be carried further to the पर. Instead of any conductor, the governor of the कार्य or प्रजापतिलोक accompanies the knower to the para. The knower of Brahman goes to the para from the Prajāpatiloka on the dissolution of the latter.'[2] Now all this elaborate explanation given by P.M. Modi is not specified in so many words in any of the śruti passage, of the Upaniṣads, not even the one quoted by P.M. Modi. In fact, the explanation given by Śaṅkara is having an advantage of being straightforward.

The next sūtra is स्मृतेश्च। (4-3-11) And on account of smṛti.

The smṛti passage referred to here states: when the dissolution has come and the end of the highest, then they all together with Brahma, with purified minds, enter the highest place.

ब्रह्मणा सह ते सर्वे सम्प्राप्ते प्रतिसंचरे।

परस्यान्ते कृतात्मानः प्रविशन्ति परं पदम्।। (Kurmapurāṇa 12-269)

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, pp. 410
2. Ibid.

All of them along with Brahman, when dissolution is imminent, with their selves purified, enter the highest place at the end of the high.

Rāmānuja, Madhva and Vallabha quote the same smṛti. P.M. Modi concurs with Śaṅkara saying 'A smṛti like the one quoted by Śaṅkara is meant by the sūtra.'[1]

The next sūtra is परं जैमिनिर्मुख्यत्वात्। (4-3-12) To the Highest (Brahman) (the souls are led), Jaimini (thinks) owing to this being the principal sense of the word (Brahman). The reference is to the C.U. स एनान्ब्रह्म गमयति। (C.U. 4-15-5) He leads them to Brahman. When the two meanings are possible, the primary or direct meaning should be preferred. Brahman can mean the higher and the lower. The higher should be adopted according to Jaimini.

Rāmānuja makes out that Brahmaloka means the world which is Brahman.

According to Madhva, this is a second pūrvapakṣa attributed to Jaimini, according to which the soul is led by mukhyaprāṇa directly to the Supreme Brahman.

Vallabha explains the sūtra in the same way as Śaṅkara.

P.M. Modi, though explaining the sūtra a bit differently considers the same v.v. quoted by Śaṅkara.[2]

The next sūtra is दर्शनाच्च। (4-3-13) And on account of the declarations of śruti. The passage possibly is तयोर्ध्वमायन्नमृतत्वमेति। (C.U. 8-6-6) Going upwards by that, he reaches immortality.

Rāmānuja says that travelling by the path of the devayāna, the soul reaches Brahman. As C.U. says एष सम्प्रसादोऽस्माच्छरीरात्समुत्थाय परं ज्योतिरुपसंपद्य स्वेन रूपेणाभिनिष्पद्यते। (C.U. 8-3-4) This serene being rising out of this body, and reaching the highest light, appears in his own form.

Madhva says that on account of the realisation of the Highest Brahman, the Highest Brahman is meant by the word Brahman.

Vallabha quotes from the Kau.U. स एनं देवयानं पन्थानमासाद्याग्निलोकमागच्छति स वायुलोकं स इन्द्रलोकं स प्रजापतिलोकं स

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, pp. 411
2. Ibid.

ब्रह्मलोकम्। (Kau.U. 1-3) Having reached the path of the gods, he comes to the world of Varuṇa, to the world of Indra, to the world of Prajāpati, to the world of Brahman.

According to P.M. Modi, 'A śruti in which the knower of Brahman is described as going to or attaining the para, the Supreme One is here meant. Such a śruti is ब्रह्मविदाप्नोति परम्। (T.U. 2-1) and also, परं ज्योतिरूपसंपद्य स्वेन रूपेणाभिनिष्पद्यते। (C.U. 8-12-2) पुरुषान्न परं किञ्चित्सा काष्ठा सा परा गतिः। (Katha U. 3-11), परात्परं पुरुषमुपैति दिव्यम् (M.U. 3-2-8) परमेवाक्षरे प्रतिपद्यते। (p.u, 4-10), तमोंकारेणायतनेनान्वेति विद्वान् यत्तच्छान्तमजरममृतमभयं परं चेति। (P.U. 5-7) On the strength of these śrutis, Jaimini argues that the conductor takes the knower of Brahman to the para. In these śrutis it is clearly stated that ब्रह्मज्ञानिन् goes to or attains the para and in C.U. 4-15-6, it is stated that he is led by an आतिवाहिक. So Jaimini concludes that the carrier takes the knower of Brahman to the para.[1] The last sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is न च कार्ये प्रतिपत्त्यभिसंधिः। (4-3-14) And the desire to enter (Brahman) cannot be with respect to the effected (Brahman). C.U. says प्रजापतेः सभां वेश्म प्रपद्ये। (C.U. 8-14-1) I enter the hall of Prajāpati, the house. Now the desire to attain the assembly hall and above cannot be with respect to the effected Brahman. It is appropriate only with respect to the Supreme Brahman.

Rāmānuja points out that what the soul aims at the condition of the Universal Self which has for its prerequisite the removal of ignorance.

अश्व इव रोमाणि विधूय पापं चन्द्र इव राहोर्मुखात्प्रमुच्य।
धूत्वा शरीरमकृतं कृतात्मा ब्रह्मलोकमभिसम्भवामि।। (C.U. 8-13-1)

Shaking off evil, as a horse his hairs, shaking off the body, as the moon frees itself from the mouth of Rāhu, I, a perfect soul, obtain the uncreated Brahmaworld, yes, I obtain it,

For Madhva, this is a third pūrvapakṣa. It argues in this sūtra, since one and the same jñānin, cannot possibly be taken to go to the Kārya Brahman, and the Supreme Brahman at the same time, the only possible way out would be to hold that some jñānins go to the Kārya Brahman and some go to the Supreme Brahman.

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, pp.. 412-413

For Vallabha also, the sūtra means, there cannot be any desire to enter into the effected Brahman, so it is the Highest Brahman.

Apratikālambanādhikaraṇam (4-3-15,16)

This is the last adhikaraṇa which has the following two sūtras:

(i) अप्रतीकालम्बनान्नयतीति बादरायण उभयथा दोषात्तत्क्रतुश्च। (4-3-15)

(ii) विशेषं च दर्शयति। (4-3-16)

The first sūtra is अप्रतीकालम्बनान्नयतीति बादरायण उभयथा दोषात्तत्क्रतुश्च। (4-3-15) Those who do not take their stand on symbols, (the superhuman being) leads, thus Bādarāyaṇa thinks, there being no defects in the two fold relation (resulting from this view) and the meditation on that (i.e. Brahman) (is the reason of this twofold relation).

The question is raised whether all worshippers of Saguṇa Brahman go to Brahmaloka. The sūtra says that only those who do not use any symbol in their meditations go there. This does not contradict 3-3-31 अनियम: सर्वासाम्, if we understand by 'all' only those worshippers who do not use any symbol. This view is justified by the scriptural statement तं यथोपासते तदेव भवति। (C.U. 4-3-15) But when it is specifically stated that it leads to Brahman, then the worship of the symbol leads to Brahman.

For Rāmānuja, these two sūtras form a part of the previous adhikaraṇa and express the view of the siddhānta according to Bādarāyaṇa. Rāmānuja reads दोषात् and not अदोषात् as Śaṅkara does. The sūtra according to Rāmānuja would mean, there not depending upon symbols he leads thus Bādarāyaṇa thinks, there being 'a defect in both case; and he whose thought is that.' So according to Bādarāyaṇa those who do not take their stand on symbols i.e. who worship the Highest Brahman and those who meditate on the individual self, as dissociated from prakṛti and having Brahman for its self are led to Brahman.

According to Madhva, the sūtra points out that an acceptance of both the alternatives, that all jñānins go to Kārya Brahman or the Supreme Brahman, in the first instance is exposed to the defects to which each taken singly is open.

Vallabha forms the adhikaraṇa of only one sūtra. Vallabha explains the sūtra in this manner: Only those who understand all

things to be really nothing but the pure Brahman and meditate thus on them are led to the Brahman. While those who first regard things as different from the pure Brahman and then meditate on them as being identical with the Brahman, i.e. those who are worshippers of a pratīka are not led to Brahman for this involves a twofold error (i) to mistake things which are really pure Brahman for something else and (ii) to meditate on things which are pure Brahman. The bhaktas, the followers of the path of devotion are taken to Puruṣottama direct as soon as he has a wish for it (tatkratu).

According to P.M. Modi, 'the possibility of the Aum being the topic here on account of the reference to प्रतीकालम्बन and the word नयति suggest that the sūtrakāra has in his view the P.U. śruti which discussed the meditation on Aum leading to Brahman. (P.U. 5)[1]

The last sūtra of the adhikaraṇa and the pāda is विशेषं च दर्शयति। (4-3-16) And scripture declares a difference (with reference to meditations on symbols), C.U. states यावन्नाम्नो गतं तत्रास्य यथा कामचारो भवति। (C.U. 7-1-5) or वाग्वाव नाम्नो भूयसी। (C.U. 7-2-1) or यावद्वाचो गतं तत्रास्य यथा कामचारो भवति। (C.U. 7-2-2) मनो वाव वाचो भूय:। (C.U. 7-3-1) As far as name reaches, he is Lord and master, speech is greater than name, as far as speech reaches, he is Lord and master, mind is greater than speech.

These passages point out that different results accrue from different symbols. There can be no such difference from those who meditate on Highest Brahman which is non-different.

Rāmānuja explains the sūtra in the same way as Śaṅkara.

According to Madhva, apratīkalambanas are those who are in a position to envision Brahman in its pervasive aspect,

They do not require the help of any medium or symbols in their meditation or envisioning.

Vallabha takes this sūtra as discussing whether there is a difference between the jñānamārgin and the bhaktimārgin. The jñānamargin attains akṣara while that jñānamārgin, who is chosen by Brahman attain Brahman.

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, pp. 414-415

According to P.M. Modi, the sūtra refers to P.U. 5-2-7 where the difference between पर and अपरब्रह्म is mentioned.

एतद्वै सत्यकाम परं चापरं च ब्रह्म यदोंकारः।
तस्माद्विनेतेनैवाऽऽयतनेनैकतरमन्वेति।। (P.U. 5-2)[1]

Here ends the third pāda of the fourth adhyāya.

Sampadyāvirbhāvādhikaraṇam (4-4-1, 3)

The first adhikaraṇa of the fourth pāda has the following three sūtras viz.

(i) संपद्याविर्भावः स्वेन शब्दात्। (4-4-1)

(ii) मुक्तः प्रतिज्ञानात्। (4-4-2)

(iii) आत्मा प्रकरणात्। (4-4-3)

The first sūtra is संपद्याविर्भावः स्वेन शब्दात्। (4-4-1) (On the souls) having attained (the Highest light) there is manifestation (of its real nature) (as we know) from the word 'own.'

The sūtra undoubtedly refers to the C.U. passage, the words from which are incorporated in the sūtra. So this can be called the transparent sūtra. The passage is एवमेवैष संप्रसादोऽस्माच्छरीरात्समुत्थाय परं ज्योतिरुपसंपद्य स्वेन रूपेणाभिनिष्पद्यते। (C.U. 7-12-3) Thus does that serene being having risen out of this body and entered into the highest light, manifest itself in its own nature. Release is not something new. It is preexistent. The soul manifests its true nature which is covered with ignorance. This is the attainment of release. It is not anything newly acquired.

Rāmānuja also explains the sūtra in the same way. He says that if the soul assumes a new body, the specifications in its own nature would be without meaning.

Madhva takes up the same passage. Vallabha takes up a passage from the T.U. for consideration. T.U. passage is सोऽश्नुते सर्वान् कामान् सह ब्रह्मणा विपश्चिता। (T.U. 2-1)

With the all-knower Brahman, he obtains all desires. Vallabha explains the sūtra in this way. 'Having reached Brahman, he becomes manifest, so says śruti.'

P.M. Modi says संपद्य is undobtedly a reference to the C.U. 7-12-3 as Śaṅkara points out.[2]

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, p. 419
2. Ibid, p. 425

The second sūtra is मुक्तः प्रतिज्ञानात्। (4-4-2) (The self which manifests its true nature) is released (as is evident) from the statement (made in the scripture). The self is freed from the three states of waking, dream and sleep and abides in its own nature. The context of the C.U. is so.

एवं त्वेष ते भूयोऽनुव्याख्यास्यामि। (C.U. 8-11-3)

I shall explain further to you and then अशरीरं वाव सन्तं न प्रियाप्रिये स्पृशतः। (C.U. 8-12-1) Him, being free from the body, neither pleasure nor pain touches and then स्वेन रूपेणाभिनिष्पद्यते स उत्तमः पुरुषः। (C.U. 8-12-3) By his own nature, he manifests himself, that is the Highest Person.

Rāmānuja explains the sūtra in a similar way.

Madhva takes this as an independent adhikaraṇa. Madhva discusses the C.U. passage स तत्र पर्येति तक्षत्क्रीडन्रममाणः स्त्रिभिर्वा यानैर्वा ज्ञातिभिर्वा नोपखनं स्मरन्निदं शरीरम्। There he moves about laughing, playing, rejoicing with women, chariots or relations not remembering the appendage of this body. These celestial bhogas referred to in the C.U. are by nature beyond the reach of any but real muktas.

Vallabha explains that, these enjoyments are enjoyed by the released souls.

For P.M. Modi, there is the same v.v. as referred to by Śaṅkara.'[1]

The third sūtra is आत्मा प्रकरणात्। (4-4-5) The light into which the soul enters is) the self, on account of the context. Context says that it deals with the Supreme Self. य आत्माऽपहतपाप्मा विजरो विमृत्युः। (C.U. 8-7-1) The Self which is free from sin, old age, death etc.

Rāmānuja and Madhva's explanation is similar.

Madhva takes this sūtra as forming an independent adhikaraṇa.

Vallabha continues to discuss the T.U. passage ब्रह्मविदाप्नोति परम्। (T.U. 2-1) With the same as like that conclusion reached by Śaṅkara.

P.M. Modi observes 'It is the individual soul who becomes manifest. The sūtrakara uses the word in the sense of the

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, p. 427

individual soul.' The last sentence just quoted by P.M. Modi is of dubious import.[1]

Avibhāgena dṛṣṭatvādhikaraṇam (4-4-4)

The adhikaraṇa has one sūtra only अविभागेन दृष्टत्वात्। (4-4-4) (The released soul exists) as inseperable (from Brahman) because that is seen (from scriputres).

The question is raised whether the released soul exists as different from or as identical with Brahman. The sūtra says that it exists as inseparable from Brahman as the śruti passage points out तत्त्वमसि (C.U. 6-8-7) Thou art that. अहं ब्रह्मास्मि। (B.U. 1-4-10) I am Brahma न तु द्वितीयमस्ति ततोऽन्यद्विभक्तं यत्पश्येत्। (B.U. 4-3-53) But then, there is nothing second, nothing else different that he could see. For Śaṅkara, अविभाग means identity here.

Rāmānuja points out that the question is whether the released soul views itself as separate पृथग्भूत from Brahman or as non-separate, being a mode of Brahman.

The sūtra says that the released soul is conscious of itself as non-divided from the Highest Brahman. This is seen. The souls have for their inner self the Highest Self. They are modes (प्रकार).

According to Madhva, the sūtra states that sāyujya muktas enjoy those bhogas which are enjoyed by Brahman.

For Vallabha, this sūtra forms a part of the previous adhikaraṇa and continues the discussion of the T.U. passage ब्रह्मविदाप्नोति परम्। The sūtra states that this sentence is not different from सोऽश्नुते सर्वान् कामान् सह ब्रह्मणा विपश्चिता।

P.M. Modi says 'दृष्टत्वात्ह्ल seems to be a reference to śrutis like न तु तद्द्वितीयमस्ति ततोऽन्यद् विभक्तं पश्येत्। (B.U. 4-3-23-32).[2]

Brahmādhikaraṇam (4-4-5 to 7)

The adhikaraṇa has the following three sūtras viz.,

(i) ब्राह्मेण जैमिनिरुपन्यासादिभ्यः। (4-4-4)

(ii) चितितन्मात्रेण तदात्मकत्वादित्यौडुलोमिः। (4-4-6)

(iii) एवमुपन्यासात्पूर्वभावादविरोधं बादरायणः। (4-4-7)

The first sūtra is जैमिनिरुपन्यासादिभ्यः। (4-4-5)

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, p. 427
2. Ibid, p. 430

(The released soul exists) as possessed of the nature of Brahman, (so thinks) Jaimini, on account of the reference etc. Jaimini thinks that the released soul's nature is like that of Brahman. It possesses the qualities mentioned in C.U. य आत्माऽपहतपाप्मा, सत्यकाम: सत्यसंकल्प: (C.U. 8-7-1)

Rāmānuja's explanation is the same as that of Śaṅkara.

For Madhva, the siddhānta from the point of view of Jaimini is that though not any longer having any physical bodies, gross or subtle, the sāyujya muktas enjoy their bhogas along with Brahman, with their ciddehas, which in sāyujyamukti abide in the body of Brahman itself. As Mādhyandināyana śruti says स वा एष ब्रह्मनिष्ठ इदं शरीरं मर्त्यमभिसृज्य ब्रह्माभिसंपद्य ब्रह्मणा पश्यति ब्रह्मणा शृणोति ब्रह्मणैवेदं सर्वमनुभवति। The knower of Brahman having liquidated his mortal body (both gross and subtle) and reached Brahman, sees through Brahman, hears through Brahman, and enjoys his bhogas through Brahman.

For Vallabha, the question is by what body, the enjoyments are enjoyed. The sūtra answers that, with the body of truth, knowledge and bliss supplied by the Lord, the भोगs are enjoyed.

According to P.M. Modi, 'we are told what is the nature of the soul's own form उपन्यास. This is a reference to the word ब्रह्म in such a śruti as तद्यथा पेशस्कारी पेशसो मात्रामुपादायान्यन्नवतरं कल्याणतरं रूपं तनुते एवमेवा यमात्मेदं शरीरं निहत्याविद्यां गमयित्वाऽन्यन्नवतरं कल्याणतरं रूपं कुरुते पित्र्यं वा गन्धर्वं वा दैवं वा प्रजापत्यं वा ब्राह्मं वाऽन्येषां वा भूतानाम्। (B.U. 4-4-4)

And as a goldsmith taking a piece of gold turns into another, newer and more beautiful shape, even so does this self after having thrown away this body and dispelled its ignorance, make unto himself another, newer and more beautiful shape like that of the fathers or of the gandharvas or of the god or of prajāpati or of Brahma or of other beings,... Śaṅkara explains ब्राह्म as refering to य आत्माऽपहतपाप्मा... (C.U. 8-7-1). But to us it appears that उपन्यास refers to B.U. 4-4-4 where the very word ब्राह्म is given, and ब्राह्म would mean possessed of all the attributes of Brahman.'[1]

The next sūtra is चितितन्मात्रेण तदात्मत्वादित्यौडुलोमि:। (4-4-6) Solely as pure intelligence (the soul manifests itself) as that is itself; thus

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, p. 432

Auḍulomi thinks. Since the soul is of the nature of pure intelligence, it exists as such in the released condition. As B.U. states

एवं वा अरेऽयमात्मानन्तरोऽबाह्यः कृत्स्नः प्रज्ञानघन एव। (B.U. 4-5-13) Thus this self has neither inside nor outside, but is altogether a mass of knowledge. Freedom from sin etc. cannot constitute the nature of the self.

Rāmānuja's explanation runs on similar lines.

According to Madhva, Auḍulomi holds that the Sāyujyamuktas have some external bhogas too; sometimes, which they enjoy with their own ciddeha and also in other forms of mukti, like Sālokya and Sāmīpya, they enjoy the bhogas through their Svarūpa-cid-deha itself which is composed of pure inteliigence.

Vallabha also explains the sūtra on similar lines.

P.M. Modi observes, 'Śankara seems to find Auḍulomi's view very agreeable to him and thinks that it is better than that of Jaimini.'[1]

The next sūtra is एवमुपन्यासात्पूर्वभावादविरोधं बादरायणः। (4-4-7) Even if it be so, on account of the existence of former qualities, (admitted) owing to reference and so on, there is absence of contradiction, (so thinks) Bādarāyaṇa.

Though it is admitted that the nature of the self is constituted by pure intelligence, the possestion of qualities like freedom from evil is not rejected from the standpoints of the world of manifestation.

According to Auḍulomi, the only characteristic of the released soul is knowledge, caitanya. Jaimini maintains that it possesses a number of exalted qualities. Badarāyaṇa favours a combination of these two views.

Rāmānuja explains the sūtra on similar lines.

For Madhva, according to Bādarāyaṇa, the sāyujya mukta receives sacramental blessing so to say from the body and limb of Brahman in order to be able to enjoy his small bit of bhoga enjoyed by Brahman with his own ciddeha.

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, p. 433

Vallabha explains that with his extraordinary body, the jīva enjoys pleasures along with Brahman and there is no contradiction. This is the opinion of Bādarāyaṇa.

P.M. Modi observes, 'Bādarāyaṇa seems to think that both the views of Jaimini and Auḍulomi are consistent with the śruti. उपन्यासात् - The sūtrakāra refers to the mention of the nature of the individual soul as mere consciousness in the śruti. There are many such texts

(a) न हि विज्ञातुर्विज्ञातेर्विपरिलोपो विद्यतेऽविनाशित्वात्। (B.U. 4-3-30)

(b) यो विज्ञाने तिष्ठन् विज्ञानादन्तरो यं विज्ञानं न वेद यस्य विज्ञानं शरीरम्। (B.U. 3-7-22)

(c) योऽयं विज्ञानमय: प्राणेषु। (B.U. 4-4-22)

(d) कर्मणि विज्ञानमयश्च आत्मा। (M.U. 3-2-7)

(e) विज्ञानात्मा सह देवैश्च सर्वै:। (P.U. 4-11)[1]

Saṁkalpādhikaraṇam (4-4-8, 9)

The adhikaraṇa has the following two sūtras viz.

(i) संकल्पादेव तु तच्छ्रुते:। (4-4-8)

(ii) अत एव चानन्याधिपति:। (4-4-9)

The first sūtra is संकल्पादेव तु तच्छ्रुते:। (4-4-8) But through the will, (the released effect their purposes), for the scriptures say so. C.U. states स यदि पितृलोककामो भवति सङ्कल्पादेवास्य पितर: समुत्तिष्ठन्ति। (C.U. 8-2-1) If he becomes desirous of the world of the fathers, by his mere will, fathers arise. The doubt arises whether will is enough or it requires an operative cause. The sūtra says that the will is enough. If any other causes, were required the scriptural statement by the will only will stand contradicted. The will of the released differs from that of ordinary men. It has the power of producing results without any operative cause.

Rāmānuja cites स तत्र पर्यैति जक्षत्क्रीडन्रममाण: स्त्रीभिर्वा यानैर्वा ज्ञातिभिर्वा। (C.U. 8-12-3)

There he wanders, laughing, playing, sporting with women, or vehicles, or kinsmen. According to Rāmānuja, all this he does by mere will and no other effect is necessary.

Madhva explains the sūtra like that of Śaṅkara citing the same passage.

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, p. 434

Vallabha explains that संकल्प is the will of the God and by his will, the soul attains him.

P.M. Modi concurs with Śaṅkara.

The next sūtra is अत एव चानन्याधिपतिः। (4-4-9)

And for this very reason (the released soul is) without a Lord. C.U. states[1]

अथ य इहात्मानमनुविद्य व्रजन्त्येतांश्च सत्यान्कामांस्तेषां सर्वेषु लोकेषु कामचारो भवति। (C.U. 8-1-6)

Those who depart from hence after having discovered the self and those true desires, for them there is freedom in all worlds. Thus a released soul is master of himself.

Rāmānuja says that the release soul realises all its wishes and is therefore not subject to another ruler.

Madhva explains that muktas being satyakāmas with power to realise whatever they wish for and being persons of sound judgement will not wish for anything to happen which will be compromising to their status, such as placing themselves under the control of their inferiors. They are, therefore, subject only to the Supreme Being and to their recognised superiors in their hierarchic order from whom they receive guidance and blessing.

According to Vallabha, the ruler of the puṣṭimārgin bhaktas is the Lord himself.

According to P.M. Modi, अनन्याधिपति may be a reference to śrutis like स स्वराड् भवति तस्य सर्वेषु लोकेषु कामचारो भवति।

He is independent, he has unlimited freedom in all worlds, But they who think differently from this are dependent on others (have others for their rulers). They have perishable worlds. In all worlds, they cannot move at all.[2]

There is no basic difference between the v.v. suggested by P.M. Modi and the one cited by Śaṅkara. The point of discussion is the 'freedom.'

Abhāvādhikaraṇam (4-4-10 to 14).

The adhikaraṇa has the following five sūtras viz.

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, pp. 438-439
2. Ibid, p. 439

(i) अभावं बादरिराह ह्येवम्। (4-4-10)

(ii) भावं जैमिनिर्विकल्पामननात्। (4-4-11)

(iii) द्वादशाहवदुभयविधं बादरायणोऽतः। (4-4-12)

(iv) तत्वभावे सन्ध्यवदुपपत्तेः। (4-4-13)

(v) भावे जाग्रद्वत्। (4-4-14)

The first sūtra is अभावं बादरिराह ह्येवम्। (4-4-10) There is absense (of body and sense organs for the released), Bādari (thinks) for thus scripture says. Will indicates mind. So has the released soul a body and senseorgans too. Badari thinks that it does not have a bod;y and senseorgans, for the scripture says (C.U. 8-12-5) He seeing pleasures through the mind, rejoices. This shows that he has only mind, and not the body or organs.

Rāmānuja quotes न ह वै सशरीरस्य सतः प्रियप्रिययोरपहतिरस्ति। अशरीर वाव सन्तं न प्रयाप्रिये स्पृशतः। (C.U. 8-12-1, 2)

Verily, there is no freedom from pleasure and pain for one who has body. Verily pleasure and pain do not touch one who is bodiless. Thus released soul is without a body.

Madhva explains the sūtra citing some Kauravya śruti, that, according to the sūtra, there is no body.

Vallabha explains that, according to Bādari, the released soul does not have a body nor pleasures.

According to P.M. Modi, आहह्येवम् seems to be a reference to such a śruti as

(a) मद्यवन्मर्त्यं वा इदं शरीरमात्तं मृत्युना तदस्यामृतस्याशरीर-स्यात्मानोऽधिष्ठानमात्तो वै सशरीरः प्रियाप्रियाभ्यां न वै सशरीरस्य सतः प्रियाप्रिययोरपहतिरस्त्यशरीरं वाव सन्तं न प्रियाप्रियो स्पृशतः। (CU. 8-12-1)

(b) तद्यथाऽहि निर्ल्वयनी वल्मीके मृता प्रत्यस्ता शयीतैवमेवेदं शरीरं शेतेऽथायमशरीरोऽमृतः प्राणो ब्रह्मैव तेज एव। (B.U. 4-4-7)

(a) O Maghavan, mortal, verily, is this body. It is held by death. But it is the support of that deathless, bodiless self. Verily, the incarnate self is held by pleasure and pain. Verily, there is no freedom from pleasure and pain for one who is incarnate. Verily, pleasure and pain do not touch one who is bodiless.

(b) Just as the slough of a snake lies on an ant-hill, dead, castoff, even so lies this body. But this disembodied, immortal life is Brahman only, light indeed.

The second sūtra is भावं जैमिनिर्विकल्पामननात्। (4-4-11)

There is presence (of body and senseorgans) Jaimini (thinks) because the scripture declares (the capacity for a released person to assume) different forms. C.U. states स एकदा भवति त्रिधा भवति। (C.U. 7-26-2) He becomes onefold, becomes threefold. So this means he possesses besides the mind, body and senseorgans. This is the opinion of Jaimini.

Rāmānuja says that the various forms of manifoldness of which the text speaks must be due to the body. The text which speaks of the absence of the body refers to the absence of that body only, which is due to Karman. It is the latter body which is the cause of pleasure and pain.

Madhva explains the sūtra in the same way. The sūtra presents the view of Jaimini holding that the soul has a body, citing from the उद्दालकश्रुति.

Vallabha explains the difference between the follower of Maryādāmārga and Puṣṭimārga.

P.M. Modi concurrs with Śaṅkara regarding the v.v.[1]

The next sūtra is द्वादशाहवदुभयविधं बादरायणोऽत:। (4-4-12) For this reason, Bādarāyaṇa (thinks that the released soul is) of both kinds, as in the case of the twelve days sacrifice.

According to Bādarāyaṇa a released soul which has attained Brahmaloka can exist both ways, with or without a body according to its desire. The same sacrifice extending over twelve days may be regarded as a satra or as an ahina sacrifice. Both alternatives are there in the scripture.

Rāmānuja, Madhva and Vallabha explain the sūtra in the same way.

For P.M. Modi, अत: means on account of the twofold śrutis, viz. those which say that the liberated soul has no body e.g. C.U. 8-12-1, B.U. 4-4-7 and those which state that the liberated soul can assume as many bodies as he likes. (C.U. 7-26-2)[2]

The next sūtra is तन्वभावे सन्ध्यवदुपपत्ते:। (4-4-13) In the absence of a body, (the fulfillment of desires is possible)' as in the dreamstate since, this is reasonable.

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, p. 442
2. Ibid, p. 443

In the dreamstate which is midway between waking and sleep, objects wished for are enjoyed even while body and senses do not really exist.

Rāmānuja says that the released soul may undergo experiences of pleasure by means of instruments created by the highest person though the released soul may not himself be creative. As in the state of dream, the individual soul has experiences depending on chariots and other implements created by the Lord. B.U. states

अथ रथान् रथयोगान् पथस्सृजते। अथ वेशान्तान् पुष्करिण्य: स्रवन्त्य: सृजते स हि कर्ता। He creates chariots, animals, to be yoked to them and roads. He creates pools , tanks and rivers. He indeed is the creator.

According to Madhva also, the sūtra explains that muktas are able to enjoy their bhogas even in the absence of a body as one does in his dreams.

Vallabha begins a new adhikaraṇa and his reading of the sūtra is also quite different. तत्त्वभावे सन्ध्यवदुपपत्ते:। (4-4-13) Vallabha takes the sūtra as describing the Lord. The Lord has no prakṛta body but it appears so like the dream.

P.M. Modi agrees with Śaṅkara.[1]

The last sūtra of the adhikaraṇa is भावे जाग्रद्वत्। (4-4-14). In the presence (of a body, the fulfillment of desires is) as in the waking state. When the released soul has a body, the objects of his wishes may have real existence as in the waking state.

Rāmānuja says that the released soul possessing a body created by its own will, enjoys its various delights in the same way as the Highest Person creates out of himself, for his own delight, the world of the fathers and so on. So he sometimes creates such worlds for the enjoyment of the released souls.

According to Madhva, the sūtra 14 explains that muktas have their spiritual bodies with which they can enjoy their bhogas. If they wish it, they can also take on a luminous body of Śuddhasattava as envisaged by Jaimini. In either case, there is no difficulty of bhoga with these bodies as in the waking state.

Vallabha continues to explain the Lord's sport

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, p. 443

As the knowledge in the waking state is true, similarly, the vision of लीला of the Lord is also true.

P.M. Modi agrees with Śaṅkara.[1]

Pradīpādhikaraṇam (4-4-15, 16)

The adhikaraṇa has the following two sūtras viz.

(i) प्रदीपवदावेशस्तथा हि दर्शयति। (4-4-15)

(ii) स्वाप्ययसंपत्त्योरन्यतरापेक्षमाविष्कृतं हि। (4-4-16)

The first sūtra is प्रदीपवदावेशस्तथा हि दर्शयति। (4-4-15) The entering (of one soul into several bodies) is like (the multiplication of) the flame of a lamp, for so the scripture declares. The sūtra says that the released soul can animate on account of its power, all the bodies even as the flame of a lamp can pass over into serval flames. The C.U. states स एकधा भवति, त्रिधा भवति, पञ्चधा सप्तधा, नवधा। (CU. 7-26-2) He becomes onefold, becomes threefold, fivefold, sevenfold, ninefold.

For Rāmānuja, the question is that, if the soul is of atomic size, how could it connect itself with many bodies. The answer is given in the sūtra. Even as a lamp abiding in one place only enters through light proceeding from it into connection with many places, so the soul also, though limited to one place, may through its lightlike consciousness enter into several bodies. Rāmānuja adds that even in this life, the soul, though abiding in one part of the body only i.e. the heart, pervades the whole body by means of its consciousness and thus makes it its own. Rāmānuja, however points out one difference. The non-released soul has its intellectual power contracted by the influence of Karman and is therefore, incapable of that expansive pervasion without which It cannot identify itself with other bodies. The released soul whose intellectual power is not contracted, is capable of extending as far as it likes and making many bodies its own. S.U. states बालाग्रशतभागस्य शतधा कल्पितस्य च। भागो जीवस्य विज्ञेयस्स चानन्त्याय कल्पते। (S.U. 5-9) The living self is to be known as a part of the hundredth part of the point of a hair divided a hundred-fold, yet it is capable of infinity.

Madhva explains the sūtra as follows in the words of B.N.K Sharma. 'Whatever the nature of the body (cit or śuddha sattva),

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, p. 443

the mukta always enjoys what is good, agreeable and pleasant. By entering into a body of śuddhasattva, if he so chooses, he enjoys his bhogas just as the flame of an oil lamp spreading through the wick feeds only on the oil in the container, in which the wick is soaked but not on its dregs or the soot produced in the process of burning.'[1]

For Vallabha, the sūtra means that the soul enjoys pleasures, because the Lord is there in him like a lamp.

According to P.M. Modi the words तथा हि दर्शयति refer to the following śrutis about the आवेश of the liberated soul.

(a) संप्राप्येनमृषयो ज्ञानतृप्ताः कृतात्मानो वीतरागाः प्रशान्ताः।

ते सर्वगं सर्वतः प्राप्य धीरा युक्तात्मानः सर्वमेवाविशन्ति।। (M.U. 3-2-5)

(b) तदक्षरं वेदयते यस्तु सौम्य स सर्वज्ञः सर्वमेवाविवेशेति। (P.U. 4-11)

(a) Having attained Him, the seers (who are) satisfied with their knowledge (who are) perfected souls free from passion, tranquil, having attained the omnipresent (self) on all sides, those wise, with concentrated minds, enter into the All itself.

(b) He who knows that Undecaying (self) who is Omniscient and enters all.

According to P.M. Modi, neither प्रदीप nor आवेश is mentioned in the v.v. given by Śaṅkara, and hence, his v.v. (C.U. 7-26-2) is not the correct one. But is it really necessary to have either the word प्रदीप or आवेश in the v.v.? Many a time, we have observed that, when there is an illustration from the mundane world, it need not have a v.v. containing the same illustration and the words, as in the sūtra 2-3-31 (पुंस्त्वादिवत्त्वस्य संतोऽभिव्यक्तियोगात्)।[2]

The next sūtra is स्वाप्ययसंपत्त्योरन्यतरामपेक्षमाविष्कृतं हि (4-4-16) (What scripture says of the absence of all specific cognition) refers either to deep sleep or absolute union (with Brahman) for this is made clear (by the scriptural texts). C.U. states स्वमपीतो भवति तस्मादेनं स्वपितीत्याचक्षते। (C.U. 6-8-1) He is gone to his own self, he sleeps they say. ब्रह्मैव सन्ब्रह्माप्येति। (B.U. 4-4-6) Being Brahman, he goes to Brahman. एतेभ्यो भूतेभ्यः समुत्थाय Having risen from out of these elements, he perishes again after them. Having departed,

1. Sharma B.N.K., The Brahmasūtras and Their Principal Commentaries, Vol. III, p. 793
2. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, p. 445

there is no more knowledge यत्र त्वस्य सर्वात्मैवाभूत्। (B.U. 2-4-14) But where the self only is all this यत्र सुप्तो न कंचन कामं कामयते, न कंचन स्वप्नं पश्यति। (B.U. 4-3-19) Where one is asleep, he desires more desires, and dreams no more dreams.

These passages deny specific cognition to a released soul. The objection is raised as to how such a released soul can assume several bodies and enjoy. These texts, it is said in reply, refer to the state of deep sleep or that of liberation, in which the soul attains union with the Absolute Brahman.

Rāmānuja refers to the passage वाङ्मनसि सम्प्लवते मनः प्राणे प्राणः तेजसि, तेजः परस्यां देवतायाम्। (C.U. 6-15-1) Voice is merged into mind, mind into breath, breath into heat, and heat into the highest deity. एतेभ्यो भूतेभ्यः समुत्थाय तान्येवानुविनश्यति न प्रेत्य संज्ञास्ति। (B.U. 4-5-13).

Having arisen out of these elements, (the self) vanishes again in them. When he has departed, there is no more consciousness.

According to Madhva, the sūtra clarifies that it is only in the two (anyatara) states of suṣupti and mokṣa, that the jivātman is really free from pain and misery.

Vallabha explains the difference between the sampatti and svāpyaya. Sampatti is higher release obtained by the path of grace puṣṭimārgīya mokṣa. The sūtra means that the absence of enjoyment spoken of in a passage like न तदश्नोति क्वश्चन refers to the condition of profound sleep whereas the enjoyment spoken of in texts like सह ब्रह्मणा अश्नुते refers to the higher release.

According to P.M. Modi, the sūtra discusses the व्यापकत्व of the releases soul.[1]

Jagadvyāpārādhikaraṇam (4-4-17 to 22)

The last adhikaraṇa has the following six sūtras viz.

(i) जगद्व्यापारवर्जं प्रकरणादसंनिहितत्वाच्च। (4-4-17)

(ii) प्रत्यक्षोपदेशादिति चेन्नाधिकारिकमण्डलस्थोक्तेः। (4-4-18)

(iii) विकारावर्ति च तथा हि स्थितिमाह। (4-4-19)

(iv) दर्शयतश्चैवं प्रत्यक्षानुमाने। (4-4-20)

(v) भोगमात्रसाम्यलिङ्गाच्च। (4-4-21)

(vi) अनावृत्तिः शब्दादनावृत्तिः शब्दात्। (4-4-22)

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, pp. 446-47

The first sūtra is जगद्व्यापारवर्जं प्रकरणादसंनिहितत्वाच्च। (4-4-17) (The released soul possesses all lordly powers) except the power of activities relating to the world (such as creation etc.) On account of (the Lord being) the subject matter (of all texts where creation etc. are described) and (the released souls) not being near (to such activities).

According to Śaṅkara, the question relates to the worshippers of saguṇa Brahman who attain Brahmaloka and wordly powers. Are their powers limited or unlimited? The opponent quotes the C.U. तेषां सर्वेषु लोकेषु कामचारो भवति। (C.U. 7-25-2) In all the worlds, for them there is freedom of movement. The sūtra says that the released souls have all powers except those of creation, preservation and destruction of the world.' The released souls work under the control of the Supreme, though they do not participate in the work of creation, ruling and dissolution of the world.

The pūrvapakṣa in Rāmānuja quotes the M.U. निरञ्जनः परमं साम्यमुपैति। He without any blemish attains the ultimate equality. For Rāmānuja, the sūtra states that world-control is the privilege of Īśvara.

For Madhva also, the muktas according to this sūtra, have all other powers but the power of creation etc.

According to Vallabha, the jīva enjoys pleasures which are bereft of the wordly process. This is borne out by the context.

According to P.M. Modi, the word प्रकरणात् refers to the C.U. य आत्माऽपहतपाप्मा विजरो विमृत्युर्विशोकोऽविजिघत्सो ऽपिपासः सत्यकामः सत्यसंकल्पः सोऽन्वेष्टव्यः स विजिज्ञासितव्यः। (C.U. 8-7-1)[1]

The next sūtra is प्रत्यक्षोपदेशादिति चेन्नाधिकारिकमण्डलस्थोक्तेः। (4-4-18) If it be said (that the released soul attains unlimited power) on account of direct-teaching, (we say) no, for the scriptures declare (that the soul attains him) who entrusts with their offices (the sun etc.) and resides in those spheres.

The sūtra says that the powers of the released souls depend on the Lord who abides in the spheres like the sun etc. and entrusts the sun etc. with their offices. The powers of the released

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, p. 449

souls are not unlimited for they get their powers from the Lord and depend on him.

Rāmānuja holds that the soul whose knowledge is no longer obstructed by Karman freely enjoys all different worlds in which the power of Brahman manifests itself.

For Madhva, the sūtra discusses the passage यो वेद स वेद ब्रह्म सर्वस्मै देवा बलिमावहन्ति। (T.U. 1-1-5) According to Madhva, the sūtra points out that the passage in question has nothing to do with the ordinary jīvas. It refers to the mukta-Hiraṇyagarbha the Lord of the circle of Ādhikārikas i.e. the gods who have been entrusted with the duties guiding and controlling their inferiors in the gradation. Hiraṇyagarbha is the controlling head of this circle. It is of him that the T.U. speaks, when it says all the other gods pay tribute to him (T.U. 1-1-5)

Vallabha discusses the passage सर्वं हि पश्यति। (C.U. 7-28-2). He preceives all. How this can be without mundane tough? Asks an opponent. The answer is, on account of the difference in time and place, this is all as a sport with the Lord, and as in a circle it is not possible to say who is the first. Similarly, in the various forms, it is not possible to say which form is the first.

According to P.M. Modi, the प्रत्यक्षोपदेश may refer to such a text as

वेदान्तविज्ञानसुनिश्चितार्थाः संन्यासयोगाद्यतयः शुद्धसत्त्वाः।
ते ब्रह्मलोकेषु परान्तकाले परामृताः परिमुच्यन्ति सर्वे॥[1] (M.U. 3-6)

The next sūtra is विकारावर्ति च तथा हि स्थितिमाह। (4-4-19) And (there is a form of the Highest Lord) which abides beyond all effected things for thus for scripture declares his abiding. C.U. states तावानस्य महिमा ततो ज्यायांश्च पुरुषः पादोऽस्य सर्वाभूतानि त्रिपादस्यामृतं दिवि। (C.U. 3-12-6) Such is the greatness of it, greater than it is the Person. One foot of him are all beings, three feet of him is what is Immortal in heaven.

The Supreme Lord abides in two forms, the transcendental and the empirical. He who worships the Lord in his empirical aspect, does not attain his transcendental form. Since, the worshipper is able to comprehend him only partially, he attains

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, p. 451

only limited powers and not unlimited powers like the Lord himself.

Rāmānuja says that the released soul while conscious of Brahman with its manifestation experiences also the enjoyments lying within the sphere of change, which abide in the world of Hiraṇyagarbha and similar beings.

He does not possess the power of creating and controlling the world which are the distinctive attributes of the Highest Lord.

According to Madhva, this is the last sūtra of the adhikaraṇa. The sūtra provides the information that the Ādhikārikamaṇḍaiasare strictly confined to their inferiors in the released state only, and does not extend to others in Saṁsāra.

Vallabha explains the sūtra in this way. Opponent raises doubt. If the sport of the Lord is eternal then, for the Lord, it is not possible to say 'I will come to your place tomorrow.' The sūtra says that it is not so, because that is also a part of the Lord's sport. The Lord is beyond any change.

P.M. Modi explains the sūtra in the following manner. 'The renewed form of the liberated shows that it is devoid of the dealings of the world like birth, death, sorrow etc. तथा हि स्थितिमाह। The abiding nature of the permanence or, we may say, the continuance of the revealed form of the liberated is mentioned in śrutis like

(i) स लोकमागच्छत्यशोकमहिमं तस्मिन्वसति शाश्वती: समा:। (B.U. 5-10-1)

(ii) तेषु ब्रह्मलोकेषु परा: परावतो वसन्ति। (B.U. 6-2-15)

In these śrutis the liberated are said to continue staying in Brahman for eternal ages.[1]

The next sūtra is दर्शयतश्चैवं प्रत्यक्षानुमाने। (4-4-20)

And thus perception and inference show. Scripture and smṛti both declare that the highest light does not abide within effected things. न तत्र सूर्यो भाति न चन्द्र तारकम्। नेमा विद्युतो भान्ति कुतोऽयमग्नि:। (M.U. 2-2-11)

न तद्भासयते सूर्यो न शशाङ्को न पावक:। (B. G. 15-6)

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, p. 453

Rāmānuja says that the energies connected with the rule of the world are exclusive qualities of the Highest Person. Śruti and smṛti also declare it,

भीषास्माद्वातः पवते भीषोदेति सूर्यः।

भीषाऽस्मादग्निश्चेन्द्रश्च मृत्युर्धावति पञ्चमः। (T. U. 2-8)

एतस्य वा अक्षरस्य प्रशासने सूर्याचन्द्रमसौ विधृतौ तिष्ठतः। (B.U. 3-8-9)

एष सर्वेश्वर एव भूताधिपतिरेष भूतपाल एष सेतुर्विधरण एषां लोकानामसंभेदाय। (B.U. 4-4-22)

मयाऽध्यक्षेण प्रकृतिस्सूयते सचराचरम्। हेतुनाऽनेन कौन्तेय जगद्विपरिवर्तते। (B.G. 9-10)

For Madhva, this sūtra is by way of an answer to the doubt about increase or decrease of स्वरूपादि of मुक्तऽ as there is meditation on Brahman by the muktas. The siddhānta is though muktas do meditate on Brahman, their Upāsanā is the continuous envisioning of Brahman with their स्वरूपज्ञान which is a constant factor. This is confirmed by Jābālaśruti स एष एतस्मिन् ब्रह्मणि सम्पन्नो जायते न म्रियते न ह्रीयते न वर्धते स्थित एव सर्वदा भवति दर्शन्नेव दर्शन्नात्मानं तस्यैवं दर्शयतो नायतिः न विपत्तिः। The jīva who has attained Brahman in this state of mokṣa is free from bodily death and birth. He neither shrinks in his bliss, nor grows enlarged in bliss. It remains constant. Though it meditates on Brahman, as the infinite Being, as his Lord and master, there is neither increment nor diminution of his bliss as he goes on meditating like this.

According to Vallabha, the conduct of the lord is beyond comprehension by logic. So state the śruti and smṛti नैषा तर्केण मतिरापनेया। (Kaṭha U. 1-2-9) This intellect should not be led away by reasoning. In the Mahabharata also,

अलौकिकास्तु ये भावा न तांस्तर्केण योजयेत्। (Mahābhārata Bhiṣma Parvan 5-12)

These objects are extraordinary and one should not apply reasoning to them.

According to P.M. Modi, śruti referred to might be

अत्र पिताऽपिता भवति, माताऽमाता लोका अलोका, देवा अदेवा.... (B.U. 4-3-22) and smṛti

(i) इदं ज्ञानमुपाश्रित्य मम साधर्म्यमागताः।

सोऽपि नोपजायन्ते प्रलये न व्यथन्ति च।। (B.G. 14-2)

(ii) मामुपेत्य तु कौन्तेय पुनर्जन्म न विद्यते।। (B.G. 8-16)[1]

The next sūtra is भोगमात्रसाम्यलिङ्गाच्च। (4-4-21)

And on account of the indications of equality (of the released souls with the Lord) only with respect to enjoyment.

Scriptures describe equality, only with respect to enjoyment and do not mention anything about creation etc,

स यथैतां देवतां सर्वाणि भूतान्यवन्त्येवं हैवविदं सर्वाणि भूतान्यवन्ति तेनो एतस्यै, देवतायै सायुज्यं सलोकतां जयति। (B.U. 1-5-23) As all beings honour that deity, so do all beings honour him who knows that. He obtains through it equality (in body) and sameness of abode with that deity. According to Rāmānuja, the śruti texts speak of the Highest Lord only as possessing the power of ruling and controlling the entire world and so this power cannot be attributed to released soul.

सोऽश्नुते सर्वान् कामान् सह ब्रह्मणा विपश्चिता।

He enjoys all pleasures with the knowing Brahman.

According to Madhva, the sūtra points out that, notwithstanding the fact that there are differences among the bhogas, some being of a higher type or order and others of a comparatively lower order, the muktas remain singularly free from increment or diminution of the bliss, amidst these varying orders of bhogas. Madhva quotes from a śruti.

Having entered the Ānandamaya Brahman, he has no birth again, no death, no decrease or increase. He eats what he likes, he drinks what he likes, he plays as per his will, he takes rest as he wishes.

According to Vallabha, only in the matter of enjoyment, there is equality to the Lord and there is a śruti

सोऽश्नुते सर्वान् कामान् सह ब्रह्मणा विपश्चिता।

P.M. Modi agrees with Vallabha about the śruti passage.[2]

The last sūtra is अनावृत्तिः शब्दादनावृत्तिः शब्दात् (4-4-22) There is non-return (for the released souls) according to scripture, non-return according to scripture. The doubt arises that, if the powers

---

1. Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, p. 454
2 Ibid, p. 455

of the released souls are limited, they may return to the mortal world. The sūtra dispels the doubt by a reference to scriptural authority. Those who go to Brahmaloka by the path of the gods do not return from there. तेषां न पुनरावृत्तिः। (B.U. 6-2-15)

एतेन प्रतिपद्यमाना इतं मानवमावर्तं नावर्तन्ते। (C.U. 4-15-6) न च पुनरावर्तते। (C.U. 8-15-1) For them, there is no return. Those who proceed on that path do not return to the life of man. He does not return.

Rāmānuja says that we know from scripture that there is a Supreme Person whose nature is absolute bliss and goodness, who is fundamentally antagonistic to all evil, who is the cause of the origination, maintenance and dissolution of the world, who differs in nature from all other beings, who is all-knowing, who by his mere thought and will, accomplishes all his purposes, who is an ocean of kindness, as it were for all those who depend on him, who is all merciful. This Supreme Lord frees his devotees from the influence of avidyā and does not turn them back into the suffering of saṁsāra. Rāmānuja quotes न च पुनरावर्तते। (C.U. 8-15-1) मामुपेत्य तु कौन्तेय पुनर्जन्म न विद्यते। (B.G. 8-16)

For Madhva, the sūtra states that there is no return of muktas to saṁsāra.

For Vallabha, the sūtra states that there is no return either for jñānin or bhakta.

P.M. Modi concurrs with the passages quoted by Śaṅkara.[1]

---

1 Modi P.M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part I, p. 457

CHAPTER - 11

CONCLUSION

Thus spake Bādarāyaṇa, Thus spoke ācāryas. We have traversed a long, probably over two millennia spanning from B. C. era down to the fag end of the 20th Century A. D.[1]

No work of Indian philosophy in Sanskrit has been more tantalisingly intrigueing than the Brahmasūtra ascribed to Bādarāyaṇa. No work has engaged more attention, erudition and ingenuity of the gigantic minds than the Brahmasūtra. No work has demanded more critical acumen, more exegetical skill and comparative scholarship than the Brahmasūtra. And yet, it would be difficult to claim to have deciphered and unravelled the mysteries of the Brahmasūtra completely. And from the view point of mysteries, the Brahmasūtra, almost on the level of the scriptures, contains mysteries (which) are not meant to be solved'[2], that is another way of expressing the impossibility of solving the mysteries.

So, here, in the foregone pages was the most humble attempt in line of the most dazzlingly illustrious predecessors who tried to ascertain and interpret the meaning of the Brahmasūtras. Fully conscious of our own limitations, we chose to deal with only one aspect of the multisplendoured mysteries of the Brahmasūtra i.e. Viṣayavākyas of the Brahmasūtra. Here also, we were not the first to break new grounds. Leaving aside the ancient commentators without whose invaluable commentatorial help, one cannot proceed any further. Even in modern times also, many erudite scholars have applied their minds to this aspect most notable among them are Dr. P.M. Modi and Dr. B.N.K. Sharma.

And yet we undertook the study of the Viṣayavākyas of the Brahmasūtra.

Was it not foolhardy on our part to undertake the study of a text which is so unyieldingly intractable? Would we be able to

---

1. The Structure and Meaning of Bādarāyaṇa's Brahmasūtras by George C. Admas, Jr., published in 1993.
2. Brown in The Death of the Messiah quoted in Newseek, April 4, 1994 article by Kenneth L. Woodward.

say new things, even if a few, when some scholars had already worked on this aspect? In the beginning this question gnawed our mind.

But as the study proceeded, we were assured that it was not so foolhardy on our part as it seemed in the beginning.

As would be evident from the foregone pages, we have presented critique of almost all the sūtras (we have omitted the 2-1 and 2 for the reasons stated there) from the viewpoint of v.v. That should be the *raison detre* of the study. But apart from this critique of the v.v.s. offered here in this thesis we were also, fortunately, able to say a few things, not noticed before, and we hope that, the scholars and readers of this study would find themselves in agreement with us.

Moreover, among the scholars who had done some work on this aspect before, Dr. P. M. Modi had confined his study only to a certain portion of the Brahmasūtra (from 3-2-11 to the end of it) and not the whole of it. Dr. B. N. K. Sharma in his voluminous study on the Brahmasūtras, had not dealt with this aspect exclusively. Even if we do not concur with the opinion that 'this (Sharma's) book amounts to little more than an eloquent defence of Madhva's interpretation'[1] the aspect of the viṣayavākya tended to be diluted and diffused in his 'The Brahmasūtras and their Principal Commentaries' work in three volumes.

So this study has an advantage of dealing exclusively with the v.v.s of the whole of the Brahmasūtra.

From the foregone study, it would be seen that, this thesis presented here can be alternatively called 'A critique of the v.v.s of the Brahmasūtra'. Perhaps for the first time a critique of each and every v.v. of the Brahmasūtras has been offered here. While doing so, it has not been necessary and not in the interest of scholarship also to differ in all respects from the scholars who have done precious work in the field. At the same time it has not been possible to uncritically agree to all the findings of the predecessors and as that also would not be in the interest of the scholarship.

---

1. George C. Adams Jr. The Structure and Meaning of Bādarāyaṇa's Brahmasūtras, p. 4.

We feel that P. M. Modi's work has been most noteworthy and yet; we feel, that he has not been given due recognition.

The latest work on the scene i.e. The structure and meaning of Bādarāyaṇa's Brahmasūtra,[1] does not condescend even to mention either him or his work.

However, at times we found it difficult to agree with the learned scholar. We have reasoned out at the respective places in the thesis. Here we may pick up an instance at random. In the sūtra हानौ तूपायनशब्दशेषत्वात्कुशाच्छन्दस्तुत्युपगानवत्तदुक्तम् (3-3-26) Śaṅkara quotes the C.U. passage अश्व इव रोमाणि विधुय. (C.U. 8-13-1) and Kau. U. passage तत्सुकृतदुष्कृते विधूनुते....... and so on (Kau.U. 1-4) P.M. Modi taking objection to the Śruti passages quoted by Śaṅkara, states that 'हानि or even the root हा to abandon does not occur in any one of the śrutipassages quoted by Śaṅkara as referred to by that word'.[2] It is not difficult to connect the meaning of हानि or the root हा with the words विधूय or विधुनुते occuring in the Śruti passages quoted by Śaṅkara. Thus there are a few places where we have not agreed with the learned scholar. But at the same time, there are not a few places where we have found ourselves in complete agreement with Dr. P. M. Modi. Vedhādyadhikaraṇam was one such place. Śaṅkara has cited such passages which have the verb-formations like प्रविध्य सर्वं प्रविध्य, हृदयं प्रविध्य धमनीः प्रवृज्य etc. Other commentators have cited various other passages. But Dr. P.M. Modi cites a Śruti passage from the M.U. which is the most suitable v. v. of the sūtra. The M.U. pasaage runs thus -

धनुर्गृहीत्वौपनिषदं महास्त्रं शरं ह्युपासानिशितं संदधीत।
अप्रमत्तेन वेद्धव्यं शरवत्तन्मयो भवेत्।। (M.U. 2-2-3,4)

Such instances of both agreement and disagreement can be multiplied.

As the study agreed and differed with and from the modern scholars, it also purported to examine the v.v.s suggested by the ancient commentators. Mostly, we found ourselves in agreement

---

1. George C. Adams Jr. The Structure and Meaning of Bādarāyaṇa's Brahmasūtras, p. 4.
2. Modi P. M., A Critique of the Brahmasūtra, Part. I, pp. 134-135.

with the v.v.s suggested by the ancient commentators. However, at some places, we could offer a critique of those v.v.s suggested by the ancient commentators. This we could do because we had chosen to go from Bādarāyaṇa to the commentators or even from Upaniṣads making a halt at Bādarāyaṇa and then to the commentators, In this process, even if we could not strike a new v.v. we could unravel the process of making a sūtra and throw light on the v.v. of its being so. To wit, in the Anṭarādhikaraṇa, the word antaḥ is there in the sūtra (1-1-20). The wording of the sūtra has been influenced by the Upaniṣadic passage considered in the previous Ānandamayādhikaraṇa in which the word antara constantly occurs आत्मा प्राणमय:, अन्योऽन्तर आत्मा मनोमय: अन्योऽन्तर आत्मा विज्ञानमय: and so on. So now the sūtra wants to examine somebody who is inside, and in the subsequent adhikaraṇas he takes up the consideration of the various Chāndogya passages indicated by the words in the Brahmasūtras viz. ākāśa, prāṇa, jyotiḥ.

And so, in Antarādhikaraṇa also, there must be a passage from the C.U. अथ योऽन्तरादित्ये हिरण्मय: पुरुषो दृश्यते...... etc. (C.U. 1-6-6, 7).

So as on the modern scholarship, this was also a sort of a critique on the ancient scholarship.

Have we ever exclaimed Eureka during the course of our study? Well, this can be very legitimately asked. At the outset we may state that, it has been very very difficult to differ from the ancient commentators. At the most, we may show a preference for a particular commentator to someone else.

We might have been able to perceive a method, or a pattern or a system behind the Brahmasūtra. द्युभ्वाद्यधिकरण (1-3-1 to 7) is an instance of such study. We had noticed at that time the Sūtrakāra's proclivity to incorporate some hints in the sūtras about v.v.s. The word द्यु is directly taken from the M.U. passage and भू as synonym of पृथिवी is also, incorporated in the sūtra. Thereby the Sūtrakāra is making an unmistakable reference to the Upaniṣadic passage i.e.

यस्मिन्द्यौ: पृथिवी चान्तरिक्षमोतं मन: सह प्राणैश्च सर्वै:।
तमेवैकं जानथ आत्मानमन्या वाचो विमुञ्चथामृतस्यैष सेतु:। (M.U. 2-2-5)

This passages has been referred to in the Sūtra द्युभ्वाद्यायतनं स्वशब्दात्। (1-3-1) The word स्व is also referring to the word आत्मानम्.

Then, in this adhikaraṇa we may note down here only for the sake of convenience that, a more transparent pattern for selecting a v.v. especially for the sūtra मुक्तोऽपसृप्यव्यपदेशात्। (1-3-2) may be perceived.

Rāmānuja quotes the following passage from the M.U. as the v. v. of the sūtra.

यदा पश्यः पश्यते रुक्मवर्णं कर्तारमीशं पुरुषं ब्रह्मयोनिम्।
तथा विद्वान पुण्यपापे विधूय निरञ्जनः परमं साम्यमुपैति।। (M.U. 3-1-3)

Śaṅkara quotes the following passage

क्षीयन्ते चास्य कर्माणि तस्मिन्दृष्टे परावरे।। (M.U. 2-2-9)

It is true Śaṅkara also quotes

यथा नद्यः स्यन्दमानाः समुद्रेऽस्तं गच्छन्ति नामरूपे विहाय।
तथा विद्वान्नामरूपाद्विमुक्तः परात्परं पुरुषमुपैति दिव्यम्।। (M.U. 3-2-8)

Śaṅkara also cites some other passages. But if we have to pinpoint the v.v. of this Sūtra (1-3-2), then, there can be no other v. v. than the passage यथा नद्यः.....परात्परं पुरुषमुपैति दिव्यम्। from the M.U. as there is a word विमुक्तः corresponding with the word मुक्त in the sūtra and there is उपैति corresponding with उपसृप्य in the sūtra. There is no scope here for that attitude i.e. either this verse or that passage or even further that verse could be the v. v, Here for the sūtra 1-3-2 only this could be the v. v.

As we have noted earlier in the beginning of this study, that we should not go out of a particular Upaniṣad a passage of which has been taken up for consideration in the adhikaraṇa. This golden rule has yielded gold in the form of new v.v.s at a few places. To cite an example in the Ikṣatyadhikaraṇa, passages from C.U. are taken up for consideration. So, for all sūtras excepting the last one, i.e. Śrutatvācca (1-1-11). We should locate the v.v.s from the C.U. only. But Śaṅkara and other commentators have cited the various passages from the different Śrutis taking the meaning of the sūtra गतिसामान्यात्। (1-1-10) as uniformity of teaching Brahman as the cause. We did not fall in line with these commentators and we stuck to the C.U. and took the sūtra as meaning Brahman is the common resort of all beings. And cited

the C.U. passage एवमेव खलु सोम्येमाः सर्वाः प्रजाः सति सम्पद्य न विदुः सति सम्पद्यामह इति। स इह व्याघ्रो वा सिंहो वा वृको वा वराहो वा कीटो वा पतङ्गो वा दंशो वा मशको वा यद्भवन्ति तदाभवन्ति। (C.U. 6-9-2).

Further, in the Jyotiradhikaraṇam we had an occasion to differ from all the commentators regarding the v.v. of the sūtra ज्योतिदर्शनात्। (1-3-40)

Śaṅkara cited the passage from the C.U. एष सम्प्रसादोऽस्माच्छरीरात्समुत्थाय परं ज्योतिरूपसंपद्य स्वेनरूपेणाभिनिष्पद्यते। (C.U. 8-12-3)

Rāmānuja cited the Kaṭha U. passage न तत्र सूर्यो भाति न चन्द्र तारकं नेमा विद्युतो भान्ति कुतोऽयमग्निः।

तमेव भान्तमनुभाति सर्व तस्य भासा सर्वमिदं विभाति।। (Kaṭha U. 2-2-15)

Madhava takes the passage from the B.U.

योऽयं विज्ञानमयः पुरुषः प्राणेषु हृद्यन्तर्ज्योतिः। (B.U. 4-3-7).

But we have taken the passage तच्छुभं ज्योतिषां ज्योतिः। (M.U. 2-2-10) as the v.v. of the Sūtra, which no other commentator has pointed out.

It was difficult to disagree with Śaṅkara. But, we had some occasions to differ from him and agree with some other commentators, say Vallabha, for example in the sūtra 1-3-16 धृतेश्च महिम्नोऽस्यामस्मिन्नुपलब्धेः। Śaṅkara has cited the passage अथ य आत्मा स सेतुर्विधृतिरेषां लोकानामसंभेदाय। (C.U. 8-4-1). But the passgge cited by Vallabha seems to be more suitable to be the v.v. of the sūtra as it brings out the greateness of Brahman more prominently and it does not have the disadvantage of being repeated. Vallabha's passages is यावान्वाऽयमाकाशस्तावानेषोऽन्तर्हृदय आकाश उभे अस्मिन्द्यावापृथिवी अन्तरेव समाहिते उभावग्निश्च वायुश्च सूर्याचन्द्रमसावुभौ विद्युन्नक्षत्राणि यच्चास्येहास्ति यच्च नास्ति सर्व तदस्मिन्समाहितमिति। (C.U. 8-1-3)

As we have agreed with Vallabha differing from Śaṅkara here. Similarly we had an occasion to differ from Śaṅkara agreeing with Madhva, in the Anukṛtyadhikaraṇam. Here in this adhikaraṇa, a piquant situation has arisen. The sūtra

अनुकृतेस्तस्य च। (1-3-22) has the following passage as the v.v.

न तत्र सूर्योभाति न चन्द्रतारकं नेमा विद्युतो भान्ति कुतोऽयमग्निः।

तमेव भान्तमनुभाति सर्व तस्य भासा सर्वमिदं विभाति॥

This passage occurs in the Kaṭha U. and M.U. as well. Which Upaṇiṣadic passage could have been intended here? Śaṅkara, Bhāskara and Vallabha have referred to the M.U. passage. But, Madhva has referred to the Kaṭha U. and he seems to be right in referring to the Kaṭha.U. passage, for the reasons cited there in the work.

So, we think, that, the foregoing discussion would suffice to give a glimpse of some of the distinctive features of the work.

Now we may refer to the Chāndogya-Brahmasūtra controversy. Though we have dealt at length with the controversy about the Chāndogya-Brahmasūtra theory first enunciated by Dr. Belvalkar, it would not be amiss here, to write a few lines regarding it.

Though MM. P.V. Kane and Prof. Bhatkhande have refuted the theory, it cannot be gainsaid that C.U. dominates the Brahmasūtra. If we say that the kernel of the entire Brahmasūtra is the first adhyāya, then the Kervel of the first adhyāya is the C.U. And apart from the first adhyāya also, at many other places, C.U. gets cited. It is true that, without interweaving other Upaniṣads, there could not have been the Brahmasūtra in its present from. It is equally relevant that, without the C.U., the present Brahmasūtra could not have been formed at all.[1] In this regard, it is also equally relevant to note the following fact.

We would not be wide off the mark if we say that Śaṅkara has been tremendously influenced by the all-time great philosopher Yajñavalkya. That is to say, according to Śaṅkara's philosophical predilection. B.U. was more to his type. And yet, we should remember that while dealing with the Pañcāgnividyā in the Brahmasūtra, Śaṅkara quotes the C.U.[2] Though there were similar passages in the B.U. almost ad verbatim and yet Śaṅkara preferred to quote the C.U. Perhaps there was no choice for Śaṅkara to quote from the B.U. There might have been a strong

---

1. As can be gathered from the index of all quotations in Śāṅkarabhāṣya prepared by Deussen in his The System of the Vedānta pp. 480 to 500.
2. 3-1-7 Brahmasūtra Śāṅkarabhāṣya.

tradition about the C.U. which tied his hands. Given the choice, looking at his rigorous, relentless pursuit of absolute monism, he would have probably preferred the B.U. to C.U. We must also remember that Śāṅkarabhāṣya on the B.U. has been most formidable commanding performance, perhaps only next to the Brahmasūtra Śāṅkarabhāsya. Nay, according to some scholars, it has been more commanding than the Brahmasūtra Śāṅkarabhāṣya.[1] Ingalls wrote 'Śaṅkara's Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣadbhāṣya is a far more original piece of writing than the Brahmasūtrabhāṣya' Ingall's argument is that in the former work i.e. bhāṣya on the Upaniṣad 'Śaṅkarācārya breaks with the traditional interpretations frequently whereas in the Brahmasūtrabhāṣya, he is very careful not to depart from tradition'.[2] What Ingalls talks about the traditional interpreatation of the Brahmasūtra must be something, like the tradition of the C.U. and the v.v.s. This. same tradition must have forced Śaṅkara to offer two interpretations of some adhikaraṇas like that of Ānandamayādhikaraṇa.

Against this background, the importance of the C.U. in respect of the B. S. becomes more evident.

This should clinch the matter in favour of the Chāndogya-Upaniṣad-Brahmasūtra.

We hope that these concluding remarks even at the danger of being repetitious should enable one to have the glimpse of some distinct features of the contribution of this work.

Thus the Brahmasūtra has been the most seminal work of Indian Philosophy and it holds a key position in understanding the Vedānta, the most influential thought of Indian philosophy.

It is also a spiritual work and the study elevates one and so, also the study has elevated me also spiritually. The least I can say is it has not left me where I was before I started, spiritually.

---

1. Quoted by Karl H. Potter, Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies, Advaita Vedānta upto Śaṅkara and His Pupils, P. 180.
2. Quoted also by E. A. Solomon in her article on 'Śaṅkarācārya's Bhāṣya on the Bṛhadārṇyakopaniṣad - A Few Salient Points, published in the volume Ādi Śaṅkarācārya-12th Centenary Commemoration Volume ed. by Dr. Gautam Patel, Published By Government of Gujarat, 1992.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brahmasūtrabhāṣyas

1. Aṇubhāṣya of Vallabhācārya ed. with a new commentary, the Balabòdhini by Paṇḍit Shridhara Tryambaka Pathak, First Ed., 1921, Pub. by Government Central Press, Bombay.
2. Aṇubhāṣya with the commentary Pradīpa ed. by Shastri Maganalal Sharma, Pub. by Butala and Company Second Reprint, 1980
3. Brahmsūtrabhāṣya of Vijñānabhikṣu ed. by Mukund Shastri, Pub. by Chowkhamba Sanskrit Granthamala, Kashi, 1901
4. Brahmasūtraśāṅkarabhāṣya with the conmentaries- Bhāmatī, Kalpataru and Parimala ed. by K.Ḷ Joshi, Introduction by Prof. E.A. Soloman. eḍ 1980
5. Brahmasūtraśāṅkarabhāṣyam with Hindi Tīkā, by Hanuman Prasad Shatshastri, Chowkhamba Vidyabhawan, Varanasi.
6. Brahmasūtrabhāṣyam by Bhāskarācārya ed. by Pandit Vindhyeshvari prasada Dvivedin Pub. by Chowkhamba Sanskrit Book Depot., Benares, 1903
7. Pūrṇaprajñadarśanam by Madhavācārya ed. by Jibananda Vidya Sagar, Second Ed. Calcutta, 1883.
8. Śāṅkarabhāṣya with the conmentaries of Bhāmatī, Kalpataru and Parimala ed. by MM Anantakrishna Shastri Second Ed., Published by NSP. 1938
9. Śrībhāṣya of Rāmānuja ed. by Kaṛmarkar R. D., Part-I, 1959, Part-II 1962 and part-III 1964, Pub. by University of Poona, Sanskrit and Prakrit Series.
10. Śrīnimabārakadarśanam ed. by Pandit Dhundhiraja Shastri, with Vedānta Pārijāta Saurabha by Śrī Nimbārkācārya and Vedānta Kaustubha by Śrī Srīnivāsācārya 1932, Kashi Sanskrit Series, No. 99.
11. Vedānta Pārijāta Saurabha of Nimbārka and Vedānta Kaustubha of Śrīnivāsa Vol. 1 & 11, (Bibliotheca Indica)

Pub. by Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta, 1940 (Vol. 1), 1941 (Vol. II), Translated and Annotated by Roma Bose

12. The Vedāntasūtras of Bādarāyaṇa with the commentary of Baladeva, Tr. by Rai Bahadur Srisachandra Vasu, Pub. by Orient Books, Second Ed. 1979.

Upaniṣads

13. 112 Upaniṣadas, Text with English translation. Ed. K.L. Joshi & others, Pub. by Parimal Publications, Delhi, 2001
14. Īśādidaśopaniṣaḍah with the commentary by Śaṅkaracārya Pub. by Motilal Banarasidass (MB), 1978
15. Upaniṣatsaṁgrahaḥ ed. by Paṇḍit Jagdishlal Shastri, Pub. by MB., 1970.
16. One Hundred and Twelve Upaniṣads and Their Philosophy By Dr. A.N. Bhattacharya, Pub. by Parimal Publications, Delhi, 1987.
17. The Sannyāsa Upaniṣads with the commentary of Sri Upaniṣad Brahmayogin ed. by T.R. Chintamani Dikshit, Pub. by Adyar Library and Research Centre, 1966.
18. The Śaiva Upaniṣads, with the commentary of Sri Upaniṣad Brahmayogin ed. by Mahadeva Shastri, Pub. by Adyar Library Madras, 1950
19. The Vaiṣṇava Upaniṣads, with the Commentary of Sri Upaniṣad Brahmayogin ed. by Paṇḍit Mahadeva Shastri, Pub. by Adyar Library, Madras, 1953
20. The Yoga Upaniṣads, with the commentary of Sri Upaniṣad Brahmayogin ed. by Paṇḍit Mahadeva Shastri, Pub. by Adyar Library, Madras, 1920
21. Thirty Minor Upaniṣads - Tr. by K. Narayanasvami Aiyar, Pub. by Parimal Publications, Delhi, 1998
22. Eight Upaniṣads Vol I & II with the commentary of Śaṅkarācārya, Tr. by Swami Gambhirananda, Second Edn. 1965, 1966 Pub. by Advaita Ashram, Calcutta.

23. Upaniṣadvākyamahākośa (Prepared from 239 Upaniṣads) by Sadhale Gajanan S., Reprint Vol, I & II, Rupa Books p Pvt. Ltd., Jaipur.

24. Dharmakośa - Upaniṣatkāṇḍa, ed. by Laxmanshastri Joshi, Vol II part II 1949 III 1949, IV 1953 Pub. by Prajna Pathasala Mandala, Wai

Other Sanskrit Texts

25. Arthasaṁgraha ed. and Tr. by G. Thibaut, Pub. by Choukhamba Amarabharati Prakashan, Varanasi, Second Edn., 1974

26. The Karmamīmāṁsā, A.B, Keith (Heritage of India Series), Pub. by Oriental Books, Second Edn. 1978.

27. Śābarbhāṣya Tr. Ganganatha Jha, Vol. I, II & III, 1933,1936

28. Mīmāṁsāsūtras of Jaimini, Tr. by Mohanlal Sandal, Vol. I & I Pub. by MB, Reprint 1980

29. The Brahmasūtras of Bādarāyaṇa, Chapter II, Quarters I and II, by S.K. Belvalkar, Second Edn. 1931, Pub. by Bilvakunja Publishing House

30. The Brahmasūtrapātha with word-Index (according to Śaṅkara) by S.K. Belvalkar, Pub. by the Bilvakunja Publishing House, Poona 1938

31. Brahmasūtrabhāṣyanirṇaya by Chidghananandapuri, Pub. by Ramakrishna Savashram, Kasbi, 1943.

32. Sarvadarśanasaṁgraha of Madhavācārya, ed. by Umashankar Sharma, 1978

33. Vedāntasāra by Rāmānuja ed. by Pandit V. Krishnamacharya, with Eng. Tra. by Shri M. B. Narasimha Ayyangar, Pub. by Adyar Library 1953

34. Aitareya Ārṇayaka, ed. by A. B. Keith, Pub. by Oxford University Press, 1969.

35. Taittrīyāraṇyaka with the commentary of Sāyaṇa, Pub. by Ananda Sharma Sanskrit Granthavali, 1981.

36. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa with Ratnadipika with Hindi Trans. By Pt. Gangraprasad Upadhyaya, Pub. by Research Institute of Ancient Studies, New Delhi, 1969

37. Āpastamba Śrautasūtra ed. by Richard Garbe, with the Commentary of Rudradatta with new appendix, Vol.I, II & III, Pub. by Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers, Pvt. Ltd., Second Edn. 1983.

38. Yājñavalkya Smṛti ed. by Narayanram Acharya, Pub. by NSP., Bombay, Fifth Edn. 1949.

39. Ṛgvedasaṁhitā ed. by Swamigangesvarananda Udasina, Pub. by Yogeshwara Gurugangesvara Charitable Trust, Bombay, 1994.

Works in English:

40. Ādi Śaṅkarācarya, 12th Centenary Commemoration Volume, Ed. by Dr. Gautam Patel, Pub. by Directorate of Information, Government of Gujarat, Gandhinagar.

41. Bhagavadgītā, Juan Mascaro, Penguin Books, Reprint, 1973

42. The Brahmsūtra, the Philosophy of Spiritual Life, Translated with an Introduction and Notes by S. Radha Krishnan, Pub. by Ruskin House, George Allen, and Unwin Ltd., London, 1980

43. A Critique of the Brahmasūtra Part-I & Part-II, 1943, 1956 by Dr, P. M. Modi, Pub. by the author.

44. Concordance to the Principal Upaniṣads and Bhagavadgītā, Reprint 1963, by Colonel Jacob, Pub. by MB

45. Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies, Advaita Vedanta, upto Śankara and His Pupils, ed. by Karl H. Potter, MB, first Edn., 1981

46. A History of Early Vedānta Philosophy by Hajime Nakamura, Pub. by MB., First Edn. 1983

47. A History of Indian Philosophy, Vol I (1975), Vol. II (1988), Vol. III (1988), Vol. IV (1988), Vol. V (1988) by S.N. Dasgupta, Pub. by MB., New Delhi

48. Hermenautics and Language in Pūrvamīmāṁsā, - A Study in Śābarabhāṣya by Othnar Gachter, First Edn., 1983

49. Introduction to the Purvamīmāṁsā by P. Shastri, Second Edn., 1980 Choukhamba Orientalia, Varanasi

50. Idealistic Thought in Indian Philosophy by Shuchita C. Divatia, 1994, Pub. by D.K. Printword Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi
51. The Making of Vedānta, by T. G. Mainkar, 1980, Pub. by Ajanta Publications, Delhi
52. The Philosophy of the Upaniṣads, by Paul Deussen, Pub. by Oriental Publishers, Delhi, 1972
53. Studies in the Sectarian Upaniṣads by T.R. Sharma, Indological book House, 1972
54. The Principal Upaniṣads, by S. Radhakrishnan, Pub. by George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London, 1953
55. The Structure and Meaning of Bādarāyaṇa's Brahmasūtras (A Translation and Analysis of Adhyaya 1), George C. Adams, Jr. pub. by MB., 1993.
56. Studies in the Sectarian Upanisads by T. R. Sharma, Pub. by Indological Book House, 1972
57. Studies in the History of Indian Philosophy ed. by Debiprasad Chattopādhyāya Vol.1, 1978, Pub. by K.P. Bagchi and Company, Calcutta
58. Sixty Upaniṣads Vol. I & II, Paul Deuesen, Tra. by V.M. Dandekar and G.B. Palsule, Pub. MB, Delhi First Edition, 1980
59. The Vedānta. A Study of the Brahmasūtras with the Bhāṣyas of Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja, Nimbāraka, Madhva and Vallabha by V. S. Chate, Second Edn. 1960
60. Shree Gopal Basu Mallik Lectures on Vedānta Philosophy By S.K. Belvalkar, Part-I, Lectures 1-6 Pub. by Bilvakunja Publishing House, Poona, First Edn. 1929
61. Vedanta Explained - Śaṅkara's Commentary on the Brahmasūtras Vol I & II, by V. H. Date, Pub. by Booksellers Publishing Co., 19540.
62. The System of the Vedanta, by Paul Deussen, Pub. by Puja Publications, New Delhi, 1983
63. The Vedānta Sūtras with the commentary by Śaṅkarācārya Tr. By George Thibaut, Part I & II Pub. by MB, 1962

64. Amarakośa (Gujarati) Tr. by K.K. Shastri, Pub. by Uni. Granthanirmana Board, Ahmedabad.
65. The Brahmasūtras and Their Principal Commentaries, by B.N.K. Sharma, Vols. I, II, & III 1978, Pub. by Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay.
66. The Chāndogya Upaniṣad and The Brahmasūtras of Bādarāyaṇa by S.M. Bhatkhande, 1982, Pub. by Uni. of Bombay.



Dr. Vijay Pandya has taught Sanskrit, Vedānta at the School of Languages, Gujarat University, Ahmedabad, Gujarat.

His areas of special interest are Classical Sanskrit Literature, Vedānta, Sanskrit Poetics and the Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa.

He is a critic endowed with a fine literary sesibility. His works like Mṛcchakaṭika and Bhavabhūti, and Anunaya in Gujarati bear testimony to this.

His book Sanskrit Textual Criticism, a collection of articles in English dealing with the Sanskrit text problems, combines in itself a sharp critical acumen and sound research faculty.

His research that Hanumannāṭakam is post-Dūtaṅgadam (a one-act-play written in Gujarat) and was composed in Gujarat is a outstanding piece of original research.

He has enriched the Gujarati language by his fine translations of the Sanskrit works like Vālmīki's Sundarakāṇḍa into Gujarati and is still at it.

His short pieces in Gujarati on the philosophical sentences from the Upaniṣads establish him as an original and inspired thinker and short essay writer in Gujarati.

At present he is working as an Honorary Professor at L.D. Institute of Indology, Ahmedabad and as a Shāstra Chūḍamaṇi Professor of Rashtriya Sanskrit Sansthan, Delhi.

PARIMAL PUBLICATIONS
Office : 27/28, Shakti Nagar, Delhi-110007 (India)
Retail Outlet : 22/3, Shakti Nagar, Delhi-110007 (India)
phs. : +91-11-23845456, 65441516, 47015168
e-mail : order@parimalpublication.com
url : http://www.parimalpublication.com

ISBN 81-7110-349-9
9788171103492
Rs. 550.00